



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600023721L







600023721L



100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100



THE
IONIAN ISLANDS;
WHAT THEY HAVE LOST AND SUFFERED
UNDER THE
THIRTY-FIVE YEARS' ADMINISTRATION
OF THE
LORD HIGH COMMISSIONERS SENT
TO GOVERN THEM.

IN REPLY TO A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED
"THE IONIAN ISLANDS UNDER BRITISH PROTECTION."

BY AN IONIAN.

E se dai tuoi flagelli aspri ed amari
Alcun percosso esclamerà suo danno ;
Dalle voci d' un solo il resto impari.
Sì che la rabbia e il concepito affanno
Farà dire a costoro, in tuo disprezzo,
Quanto inventar, quanto sognar sapranno.
SALVATOR ROSA.



LONDON :
PUBLISHED BY JAMES RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCLI.

226. L. 27.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΙΟΝΑΣ.

ΦΙΛΑΤΟΙ ΣΥΜΠΟΛΙΤΑΙ,—

Τὸ φυλλάδιον τοῦτο, τὸ ὁποῖον ἐδημοσίευσα πρὸς ὑπεράσπισιν τῆς πατρίδος μας ἐναντίον τῶν προσβολῶν ἐνὸς συκοφάντου, δὲν ἐγράφη δι' ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἀπευθύνεται πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τῆς Ἀγγλίας καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλη τῶν Ἀγγλικῶν Βουλῶν, ἐξ ὧν μόνων χρεωστοῦμεν νὰ ἀναμένωμεν τὴν πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐλπίζομένην θεραπείαν τῶν παραπόνων μας. Ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο ἐν μέρει πρὸς ἐνίσχυσιν τοῦ μέσου, τὸ ὁποῖον ἀνεκάλυψα, καὶ μεταχειρίσθην ἐπὶ πολλὰ ἔτη, δηλαδὴ τοῦ ἐκκαλεῖν κατὰ τῶν μεγάλων Ἀρμοστῶν καὶ τοῦ ὑπουργείου τῶν ἀποικιῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀγγλικοῦ λαοῦ, μὴδ' ἔμεινεν ἄνευ ἀποτελέσματος τοῦτο, ὡς κάλλιστα ἠδυνήθητε νὰ κρίνετε ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὁμοθύμων ἐλέγχων τοῦ Βρετανικοῦ τύπου, καὶ ὡς νῦν θέλετε ἰδεῖ ἐκ τῆς ἀκολούθου σημειώσεως τῆς προτάσεως, τὴν ὁποίαν αὐτὸς ὁ Πατριάρχης τοῦ Κοινοβουλίου ὁ γενναῖος φίλος μας Κύριος Ι. Γϋουμ, ἔδωκε διὰ τὴν προσεχῆ σύνοδον καὶ τῆς ὁποίας τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν εἰς τὴν πρὸ ὀλίγου λήξασαν μὲν ἡ ἀξιοκαταθρήνητος ἀσθένειά του παρεμπόδισε.

Πρότασις γενομένη τὴν ὀγδόην Αὐγούστου, 1851, παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Γϋουμ·

Περὶ τῶν ἸΟΝΙΩΝ ΝΗΣΩΝ.—Ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὴν Αὐτῆς Μεγαλειότητα, ὅπως εὐαρεστηθεῖσα εὐμενῶς, διατάξῃ τὴν παρακατάθεσιν ἀντιγράφων ὅλων τῶν μεταξὺ τοῦ Σιρ Ε. Γ. Οὐάρδου μεγάλου Ἀρμοστοῦ τῶν Ἰονίων Νήσων καὶ τοῦ Λόρδ Γρέϋ, ἐγγράφων, ἀφορώντων τὴν πρώτην συνεδρίασιν τῆς νέας Συνελεύσεως αὐτῆς τῆς δημοκρατίας, τὰς χρονολογίας τῶν διαφόρων συνεδριάσεων τῆς Συνελεύσεως καὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν καθ' ἃς συνεδρίασεν αὕτη, τὰς ὑποθέσεις τὰς ἐνεργηθείσας παρὰ τῆς Συνελεύσεως, τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν διακοπῶν καὶ τὰς χρονολογίας ἐκάστης διακοπῆς, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰτίας, δι' ἃς ἡ Συνέλευσις διεκόπη, τοσάκις καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον.

Τῶν ἐγγράφων ἡ ἀναφορῶν περὶ τῶν μεταβολῶν τῆς τοπικῆς δικαιοδοσίας τῶν Δικαστῶν ἐν ταῖς διαφόροις νήσοις, καὶ δι' οὓς λόγους ἐπεμβῆκαν οὕτως εἰς τὴν διεύθυνσιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν Γερουσιαστῶν τὴν μέθοδον τῶν ἐκλογῶν των, καὶ δι' ἣν ἐκλέχθησαν, περίοδον, τοὺς ὑποίους λαμβάνουν μισθοὺς, ἅπερ ἔχουν ἐκπληρῶσαι χρέη, τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον τῶν δημοσιευθέντων διαταγμάτων κατὰ τὴν διακοπὴν τῆς παρούσης ἐλευθέρως ἐκλελεγμένης Συνελεύσεως, καὶ τὰ διάφορα ὑπουργήματα τὰ παρ' ἐκάστου Γερουσιαστοῦ ἐκπληρούμενα, καὶ ποσάκις ἕκαστος Γερουσιαστῆς καθεῖξε τὴν αὐτὴν Θέσιν ἢ ὑπουργημα καὶ τὸ ποσὸν τῶν ληφθέντων παρ' ἐκάστου μισθῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν ἐκάστου τοιοῦτου ὑπουργήματος.

Καὶ ἀντίγραφα τῶν μεταξὺ τοῦ Σῆρ Ε. Γ. Οὐάρδου καὶ τοῦ Λόρδ Γρέυ ἐγγράφων, ἐξηγούντων τὰς αἰτίας τῆς προσφάτου παύσεως τῶν δημοτικῶν συμβουλίων ἐν τῇ Ἰονίῳ δημοκρατείᾳ καὶ τῶν μεταβολῶν εἰς τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν νέων συμβουλίων, δεικνυμένου δι' ὧν διαταγμάτων ἡ ἐξουσία ἐγένοντο αἱ ἀλλαγαὶ αὗται.

Ἡ ὑπομονὴ τὴν ὁποίαν ἐξησκήσατε ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο, δὲν θὰ τεθῇ ὑπὸ πολὺ μακρυντέραν δοκιμασίαν, διότι τὸ κοινὸν αἶσθημα τῶν Ἀγγλων, ἐξαναστὰν τέλος τῶρα εἰς τὰς παρὰ τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων των κακώσεις σας, θὰ προξενήσῃ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἀλλαγὴν τινα εἰς τὸ σύστημα, τὸ ὑποῖον ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο σᾶς κατεπίεξε. Οὕτως ἡ ὥραίᾳ μας πατρίς ἡ Γρισάλδη τῆς Ἀδριατικῆς θὰ κατακτήσῃ ἐπὶ τέλους τὴν σιδηρὰν θάλησιν τῆς κραταιᾶς αὐτῆς προστατρίας διὰ τῆς ἀπλῆς δυνάμειος τῆς ταπεινότητος καὶ καρτερίας.

Ὁ Φίλος καὶ συμπολίτης σας,

Ὁ ἸΟΝΙΟΣ.

Ἐν Λονδίῳ, 12 Αὐγούστου, 1851.

TO THE IONIANS.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN,—

This Pamphlet, which I publish to defend our country from the attacks of a slanderer, is not written for you ; it is addressed to the people of England and to the Members of the English Legislature, from whom alone we must expect the long-looked-for redress of our wrongs. It is in furtherance of the course I have carried out during several years—that of appealing from Lord High Commissioners and the Colonial Office to the people of England ;—nor has this been without result, as you must have been enabled to judge from the unanimous remonstrances of the British press in our favour, and now, as you will see, by the following notice of Motion which that patriarch of the House of Commons, our generous friend Mr. J. Hume, has given for the next Session, and which his late lamentable illness alone prevented his bringing forward in the one just closed.

Moved the 8th August, 1851, by MR. HUME :—

33. IONIAN ISLANDS: Address to her Majesty—That she will be graciously pleased to order copies of all Despatches between Sir H. G. Ward, Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, and Earl Grey, respecting the first meeting of the New Assembly of that Republic ; the dates of the several meetings of the Assembly, and the number of days which it has sat, the business done by the Assembly, the number of prorogations, and the dates of each prorogation ; and also the Causes for which the Assembly was so frequently and so long prorogued :

Of the Despatches or Reports of the Changes of the local jurisdiction of the Judges in the different Islands, and the reasons for thus interfering in the administration of Justice :

Return of the number of Senators, the method of their election, and the period for which elected, the salaries they receive, the duties they have to perform, the number and object of the ordinances which they have passed during the prorogation of the present free-elected Assembly, and the several offices filled by each senator, and the number of times that each Senator has filled the same place or office, and the amount of salaries received by each whilst filling each such office :

And, Copies of the Despatches between Sir H. G. Ward and Earl Grey, explanatory of the causes of the recent suspension of the Municipal Councils in the Ionian Republic, and of the changes in the mode of electing the new Councils, stating by what ordinances or authority those changes were made.

The patience you have so far exercised will not have to endure much longer ; for the public feeling of Englishmen, now at last aroused to the ill-treatment of you by their representatives, will soon cause a change in the system of that administration which has so long oppressed you : so shall our beautiful country, the Griselda of the Adriatic, at last conquer the iron will of her Powerful Protector by the mere force of humility and endurance.

Your Friend and Countryman,

THE IONIAN.

LONDON, *August* 12, 1851.

THE IONIAN ISLANDS.

A REPLY,

&c. &c.

Ἴσκεν, ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτυμοῖσιν ὁμοῖα.

HOMER. Od. T. 86.

THE importance of the Ionian Islands as a military and naval post is well known to English statesmen. The permanent possession of Algiers by France, and her ready command of the Italian coast, as shown by her double occupation at the same time of Ancona and recently of Rome, to say nothing of the aggrandizing effects of Russian policy on the Black Sea, have given to Great Britain what the Duke of Wellington not inaptly denominated, in 1833, "essential duties to perform in the Adriatic." The commercial advantages which might result to Great Britain for her occupation of these Islands, pointed out so admirably by Sir C. J. Napier, in 1830, have hardly yet drawn sufficient attention, indeed, have been nowhere noticed, except in the reports of Lord Seaton, in 1845-6, and 1847-8, who was the first to observe and encourage the nascent commerce of Ithaca and Cephalonia with the Black Sea, to rouse the British Government to its importance, and to foster, promote, and encourage it to its present rapid increase. What position hereafter the Ionian Islands may occupy in the commercial map of Europe, should the frontier of Germany be drawn, as now proposed by the Dresden Conferences, down to Dalmatia, depends on that contingency,

which will assuredly render them, with the whole of Germany on the one side open to their commerce, a well-poised centre of trade, between the Northern States of Europe and the Eastern world.

But, whatever may be the future political or commercial importance of the Ionian Islands, certain it is, that unless some great and effectual change be made in the manner in which their government is at present administered by Great Britain, under the name of Protection, they will remain for ever a blot on the scutcheon of that Power; a standing proof to the world of her reckless disregard of Treaties; of her continued tyranny and oppression over States committed to her charge, whose weakness and whose love of freedom deserved at the same time her sympathy and her support.

During the past thirty-five years, the Ionians have, from time to time, in vain endeavoured to excite attention to their grievances, either from the statesmen, or the Parliament of Great Britain. At last, and in despair, finding that an ignorance, almost universal, prevailed on the subject, I applied myself sedulously to the publication, in this country, of such intelligence and comments on Ionian matters as I could make available through the press; and I have been urged to this exertion in my country's behalf, because, roused by an outrageous abuse of military power committed against my Cephalonian countrymen, under the orders of Sir H. Ward, I felt that an occasion had arisen, on which, by a mere broad statement of the fact that *twenty-one* persons had been officially hanged, several shot, and that floggings without trial, to the acknowledged number of ninety-six, had taken place there, and were relied upon as means of punishment, I felt convinced that I could at once ensure the sympathies and awaken the attention of the English nation to the cruelties and tyrannies perpetrated under their name in the Ionian Islands.

The result has been an effective response from the whole of the public press of Great Britain, and the demonstration of an unusual interest in the subject in the House of Commons; which, though the question was shuffled over, on the last discussion of Mr. Hume's motions of July 22 and August 9, 1850, has, nevertheless, had the effect of rendering not far remote some serious and great change in the policy hitherto adopted in the administration of these Islands.

It is hardly necessary to state the fact that, according to the usual system of the Colonial-office, all governments which are carried on under its auspices, though nominally directed by a Governor, are actually administered by a clique of officials, or a Bureaucracy on the spot, who, through all changes of ministerial policy, and under whatever Governor, remain identically the same—who invariably cling together, and act in concert—so that (as is sometimes seen in greater administrations) whoever goes out, they shall always keep in. Just such a Bureaucracy has existed in the Ionian Isles since the year 1815, when Sir T. Maitland started off at score with a creation of 350 places, and when Mr. (now Lord) Brougham described them, in a Financial Debate (Feb. 12, 1816), as follows:—“Productive of nothing else, they are exceedingly rich in patronage. There must be governors, and secretary, and commanders in chief, and commissioners, and port-admirals, and the whole apparatus of patronage;” and again, speaking of other possessions equally misgoverned—“All had their harbour-masters, their barrack-masters, their little sinecure placemen, and their little operative placemen; every one was in fact a little Ionian Island.”

This Bureaucracy has, however, of late, been stricken with a great alarm. Their hold of office has also become exceedingly insecure. A ray of light has broken in upon their rat's nest; the snuffing and scratching of the sharp-nosed terrier of economy is heard all about their

lairs. Worse than all, their salaries have been reduced ! Their old trick of playing off an insurrection to rouse the fears of a new Lord High Commissioner has been played off, and has had its usual bloody result ; but, unluckily for their interests, it has excited too great attention out of the Islands—so that the people of Great Britain have asked the Prime Minister “ Why is this ? ” Nothing remained for them, then, but to put forth some audacious misrepresentation, by which the English public might be deluded. This has been done, at their instance, in the pamphlet on which I am now about to animadvert, entitled “ The Ionian Islands under British Protection ; ” which pamphlet is not so much a counter statement on the part of Sir Henry Ward, in regard to the many grave charges against him, as a defence of the administration of the government of the Ionian Islands from first to last, by the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy, under whose fatal advice he acted, as well as a vehement objurgation of the policy of Lord Seaton, who refused to deliver himself over to their control.

The opening Greek quotation, the constant reference to Thucydides and Mr. Grote, and the perpetual citation of passages of the Peloponnesian war, the associated pedantry and dulness, and the avowed deference to constituted authority, the ever-ready cane for the little boys (the Ionians), and the polite praise and perpetual goodness of the fathers and mothers and guardians (the English officials), might at first lead me to coincide with report, which attributed this *brochure* to the Rector of the Ionian University at Corfu, “ a certain Mr. Bowen ; ” but that I cannot imagine that any cause, even the reduction of his own salary, in conjunction with other reductions by a State which cannot pay its debts, could induce a scholar to step down from the calm philosophy of his duties as a teacher into the arena of political conflict, especially to frame a fierce, unqualified, and libellous

attack, on a people, the education of whose youth he has been appointed to superintend.

The writer boasts his "access to official documents" as a qualification for his task. Now, all important official documents, as regards the Ionian Islands, are public, as the Gazettes, and the Despatches of the Lord High Commissioners. But he, who, in writing or commenting upon the history of the Ionian Islands under the British Protection, shall confine himself to official documents and despatches, will tell but half his story. He must go to Hansard's and read there the old and long story of our wrongs as told by Sir C. Monck in 1816, and by Mr. Hume in 1821 and 1822. He must study the *Promemoria** of the Chevalier Mustoxidi and his *Confutazione*,† the vindication of himself and countrymen against the reply of Sir Howard Douglas. He must read the memoir of Count Capo d'Istrias, who drew up the Treaty of Paris,—addressed to Earl Bathurst, in strong remonstrance against its infraction,—as well as the pamphlets of Count Viaro Capo d'Istrias upon Sir H. Douglas' administration, of Dr. Zambelli‡ on the universal maladministration, and many others whom I cannot here find time to recapitulate.

After complaining of the "bitter attacks" on Sir H. Ward, "not in the Ionian Islands only, but wherever, throughout the whole Levant, the Greek race dwell and the Greek language is spoken,"—as if to have disgraced the Greek race by flogging Greeks is not enough to raise the universal ire of all the Greek race,—the author of this pamphlet goes on to say, that "those who are thoroughly

* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, June 22, 1840, on the motion of Lord Charles Fitzroy.

† *Al Dispaccio dei 10 Aprile, 1840, Confutazione, &c.* Malta: Izzo & Co. 1841.

‡ A Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Grey. London: Cox (Brothers). 1848.

acquainted with the real merits of the case feel it to be their duty towards the public functionary who has been calumniated, &c., to set forth clearly the whole truth."

Now I can save the writer and the reader a great deal of trouble on this point at the outset. As regards the "public functionary," so dolorously spoken of as "calumniated," the following are facts, which neither he himself in his Despatches, nor his pedantic defender in this pamphlet, disavows or denies. These that I now give are the facts, the whole gist of which it is this writer's object to excuse, be it remarked, not to deny; I like to keep them in the front, especially when I read about "bitter attacks wherever the Greek race dwell and the Greek tongue is spoken." Let Englishmen read this list, and blush for the deeds, not committed only under their name, but justified, excused, and defended, as right, and proper, and expedient, and as necessary means and instruments of English legal government, and a part of the *blessings* of a British Protection extended to a weak State.

These are as follows :—

1. The exaggerating into a general rebellion throughout Cephalonia what was in reality a mere local outrage in a small district.
2. The far exceeding even the arbitrary powers vested in the Lord High Commissioner by the Constitution.
3. The exposing men to trial by courts-martial, and thereby depriving them of the protection of the forms of justice.
4. The continuing martial law throughout Cephalonia after the trifling riot there had been instantly suppressed by the people themselves.
5. The shooting and hanging, according to official despatches, twenty-one individuals, more or less criminal, and some innocent—two of them only, Vlacco and Nodaro, deserving the capital punishment—for this merely local disturbance.

6. The flogging by cat-o'-nine-tails (a punishment hitherto unknown in the Islands or in Greece) no less than three hundred persons in Cephalonia, whereof many are asserted by the public papers to have subsequently died, and of which all account was kept back in his public speech to the Legislative Assembly.

7. The burning down houses, uprooting vineyards and currant plantations, as a punishment upon suspected or criminated individuals.

8. The causing two innocent persons to undergo the feeling and terror of death, by a simulated execution, as a means of torture, to obtain testimony from them as to the concealment of arms by their neighbours.

9. The suborning spies and encouraging information of conspiracies and seditions which had no existence but in the brains of the informer, who cheated him out of £30; and then refusing to give up the name of the informer, or even to punish him for the false information which had caused such terror and dissatisfaction throughout the country.

10. The stopping the Cephalonian press; consigning the editors to banishment, without form of trial, in violation of all the guarantees of the law of the press.

11. The committing outrages on the rights of citizens and the sanctity of private life in Corfu, by invading their dwellings at night, seizing their papers, and imprisoning their persons, subsequently exiling several of them without any trial or hearing, or even answering their petitions and public remonstrances, as in the case of the Italian Colonel Zambeccari, Rocco Contrini, and others.

12. The banishing, likewise without hearing or trial, several editors of newspapers.

This is but an abridgment of the charges brought against Sir H. Ward, and these are the "calumnies" in question. After this we will go on to what the learned author, who takes up, on his road, the defence of Sir T.

Maitland and his measures, styles the "exceedingly curious inquiry." Curious, indeed, to see the flesh of a tortured victim wince and writhe at the hot nippers!—an inquiry curious, he informs us, both "as regards the conduct of the Protected People, or the policy of the Protecting Power."

The policy of England should be at all times to do right and act straightforward; but this would not suit the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy, with whom the policy of England is defined as being a delusion and deceit, and is characterized as such, and lauded for being such from beginning to end, throughout this pamphlet. Of the conduct of the Protected People little more need be said than that from 1815 to 1850 they have never ceased, year after year, with the exception of the brief intervals of two years under Lord Nugent, and five years under Lord Seaton, from remonstrating against the successive tyrannical encroachments by the Lord High Commissioners on their liberty, and the haughty refusal of these functionaries even to carry into effect the small modicum of rights, doled out to them by the masquerade Constitution of Sir T. Maitland.

Before dashing into a history of the Ionian Islands from the creation, our author proceeds to refer to Thucydides and his disquisition on the condition of the people, and the state of parties in Corcyra at the period of the commencement of the Peloponnesian war. But why should we drag Thucydides by the head and shoulders into this discussion? "*Τὴ πρὸς Διόνυσον*;" we might reply with equal pedantry. The learned author writes like some Head of an English college, who publishes a pamphlet on a change in the ministry, crammed full of Greek quotations, and arguments founded on the opinions of Cæsar and Cicero, brought to bear on the "present crisis." Xenophon, we know, wrote on the Budget question of Athens, but I fear he would be but a

poor authority on the relative merits of a window or an income tax.

So also might it be said of the author's observations on the Venetian rule in the Ionian Islands. With the Venetian times and laws what have we now to do? The question is of the Ionians as under the British Protection. Nevertheless, I must tell this writer that the elder Ionians have not failed to observe that the Venetians were at least just—that they did not oppress the people with taxation, (the taxes then being scarcely one-sixth of what they are now), and that, what is more important to the present matter, all offices and honours, under the Venetian possession of the Islands, were open to the Ionians, throughout her great and wealthy empire. Can England say the same? Has one Ionian yet found his way into *her* service? *her* army? *her* navy? *her* government offices? at home or abroad? Nay, more, is it not a fact that an Ionian gentleman, who was appointed to her Court in the service of a foreign Sovereign—in the service of Greece—for whose liberation he had taken part, was informed that, being an Ionian, he was a British subject, and, therefore, could not be permitted to serve a foreign Sovereign at the British Court. “I will not let you serve me, and you shall not serve any one else,” is the language held by Great Britain to the Ionians. We are not even permitted to serve our own country, for it is notorious that every post of honour and emolument in the Islands is filled, up to this very day, by Englishmen, Corsicans, and Sicilians, who were originally in the British service, either military or civil, and who were thus quartered on the Ionian finances by way of rewarding their services to England. So much so, that, from very shame, Lord J. Russell, ten years ago, when refusing every other concession, and chiding the asker, was compelled to recommend to Sir Howard Douglas—

“The advancement of young Ionians, in the subor-

dinate offices, with a view to select those of whose abilities and integrity the Lord High Commissioner of the Protecting Sovereign is satisfied for the higher posts of the State."

Has this been done? I challenge the reply, and will venture to declare that, since that period, more young Ionians of abilities and integrity have been discharged from subordinate offices than advanced in them. What, on this point, is the confession of the writer himself? What facts can so forcibly bespeak a series of misgovernment during the whole thirty years of the Protection, as the following, which I find at p. 128-9 of this pamphlet?

"From the present anomalous condition of the Ionians, the very qualities that elsewhere lead to honour and happiness produce here restlessness and turbulence. An Ionian has no sufficient scope for his ambition, his energy, his intelligence, or his patriotism. The few paths to distinction at home are all overcrowded already, and he cannot seek distinction abroad, either as a Greek or as an Englishman. He is neither a subject of King Otho, nor a subject of Queen Victoria; as Sir H. Ward writes to Earl Grey (July 9, 1849), 'The constant subdivisions of property have created a class of young and poor gentlemen, who cannot all be advocates, or medical men, or government *employés*, who have no army or navy to go into; and who, with the bare means of living at their command, not unnaturally look with hope to any change that would open to them a wider field.' From this class the writers and talkers against British connexion chiefly spring; and its existence forms the real obstacle to any rapid or permanent change of the present state of public opinion in the Ionian Islands. They have no army, no navy, no literature, no national brotherhood of science and arts. Nor can the Ionian citizen, like the British colonist, look for honour in these various fields by for-

getting the place of his birth, and seeking it in the English service : Burke, Sheridan, the Duke of Wellington, and many other great men in our history, won fame for themselves in the wide career opened to them as British subjects, at a period when the land of their birth was as much a colony as Canada and Australia at the present day. We must not wonder if we find that every intelligent Ionian has a feeling of bitterness at his heart because the political condition of his country condemns him to hopeless inferiority. This sentiment may be rather felt than uttered by many; some may perhaps hide it from themselves. But it exists most undoubtedly, and will continue to exist as long as the present system is maintained."

It was, then, for this purpose that "the sons of the higher orders were sent to be educated in Italy," a fact which the writer would make a crimination against the Venetians; neither was "every attempt made to destroy the cherished nationality of the people." Their municipal institutions were carefully preserved, and though Venice made Corfu her chief arsenal and the *point d'appui* for her operations in the East, she did not, as England has done, make the Ionians pay for her fortifications and the support of her troops. So far, also, was she from interfering with the internal administration of the country, that the writer of the pamphlet himself brings it forward as a matter of accusation, that "the Venetian governors found it necessary to avail themselves of the influence of a few of the natives to rule the others." I will concede to the author, that hence the Ionian aristocracy "were enabled to overawe and oppress the lower orders;" but of what country at that time, except in happy England (and even there I have heard of a dominant landed aristocracy and of the power of "great families"), might not this same aristocratic oppression of the lower classes be predicated? True, also, it may be, in some small degree, as the writer says,

though not, unfortunately, solely "from traditionary recollection of those evil days," that "the Ionian peasants even now regard their *Seigneurs* with a Helot mixture of fear and aversion, which from time to time, AS LATELY IN CEPHALONIA, breaks out into cruel and bloody excesses." I gladly accept this testimony of an eye-witness, and one who "has access to official documents," that the late affair in Cephalonia was, as I have always held it to have been, what Lord C. Fitzroy declared it, "an agrarian riot," directed against particular private persons, and not proceeding from disaffection to the Government, who, by the hands of Sir H. Ward, repressed it and punished the misguided men with so much bloodshed and cruelty.

In what I am now about to say, I wish it to be distinctly understood once for all, that I draw the most marked distinction between the Protection of Great Britain, and those whom Great Britain either left us or sent over to us to administer and carry out that Protection. From first to last, I entertain no doubt that Great Britain meant to do right—intended that her Protection should be of that service to us which we so fondly hoped it would be; and hoped that, under her shelter, our commerce would grow and expand, our institutions flourish, our education increase, while the Ionian Islands would realise the ancient romantic notion of the Islands of the Blessed. But, unfortunately, those who were sent from time to time to rule over us, that fatal ever-enduring Bureaucracy of placemen, whose pestiferous influence blights all within their circle, have carried out the system of British Protection after the old method of the Venetian administration so fairly depicted by Count John Capo D'Istrias in his "*Observations sur l'état intérieur des Iles Ioniennes*," addressed to Lord Castlereagh at Paris, Nov. $\frac{10}{12}$, 1815.

"La puissance de ce gouvernement consistait dans l'art perfide de relever les préjugés de la noblesse et de

les mettre en opposition avec les prétentions de la bourgeoisie et les droits légitimes du peuple."

From first to last it has been the endeavour of the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy to make the landed aristocracy their slaves, and to govern by them—an aristocratical party like that of Athens, which, according to the writer of this pamphlet (p. 14), "Thucydides tells us (viii. 19) would have been glad to have preserved, if possible, the political independence of their country, but were ready to sacrifice it to Sparta, rather than fall under the power of their own democracy," *i. e.* rather than see the power pass from their own hands. These are the "men of substance and intelligence" (p. 13), "the eminent and influential citizens," who, in 1817, afforded Sir T. Maitland "the true basis on which the British Government was to proceed in forming a Constitution for the Islands;" these were the men who, at the instigation of Sir T. Maitland, were ready to express a wish that there had been no Treaty of Paris (p. 14), and that their country had never been declared independent, a fact now for the first time openly acknowledged.* It is this aristocratic government, in a State whose institutions and whose local habits are essentially democratic, that the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy have been throughout desirous to maintain. It is his destroying the basis of the whole fabric of this aristocratic government, that has brought upon Lord Seaton the bitter attacks of the defeated party, and occasioned the threnodia which we find at p. 77.

"If the English system of polling were to be adopted, that is, if open voting were to enable the principal gentlemen of the country to exercise their legitimate influence over their dependants, Sir H. Ward, the Whig civilian, the advocate of the ballot in the House of Commons, would be undoubtedly returned; whereas, by

* Remarks, &c., by Count Viaro Capo D'Istrias. London: T. Brettell. 1841. (P. 12.)

secret voting, Lord Seaton, the military Conservative, would be certain of success."

Every Englishman knows so well what "legitimate influence" means in such cases, that I need go no further than to state that it is the loss of this "legitimate influence" which the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy have to lament through the much-complained-of reforms in legislature, and the regulation of the finances of the State introduced by Lord Seaton.

Even the French rule in these States, despite its irreligion, its immorality, and the despotism of those who administered it, was not unproductive of benefit to the Ionians. Its democratic forms aroused the national spirit. Men began to speak of their "country." The native language came once more into fashion in high places. The people heard their own language in the Courts of Justice, and could understand how justice was administered. The religion of the people was declared to be that of the nation; and "in spite," says the same authority, "of the abuses of military power, and the terrible reaction of different parties, repressed in a short time by the severe system of police—the people lived happily."

The writer of this pamphlet claims great credit for Sir T. Maitland, at p. 22, for his "full and final re-establishment of the Greek Church," and at page 16 for his rescue of the Ionians "from the anarchy and oppression of their own countrymen." But, surely, all this was already done to his hands by the French administration. The Greek Church had not fallen back, neither had the police system been abrogated. The Turks once driven out from their assumed, though mildly-exercised suzeraineté, (which, however, the free Christian spirit of the Ionians could not acknowledge,) Russia acted as their Protecting Power, with only one regiment, until 1807; nor do we hear of any complaints except the one of that odious aristocratical party, who, defeated in their

hateful union with the Turks, to obtain the dominant power for themselves, actually applied to the Emperor of Russia to subvert the Constitution, and demanded another, placing the functions of the State in their own hands, with a prayer that it might be "supported by an imposing armed force to resist the obstinate and wilful attempts that would be put in motion to subvert it."

This is the party so lauded by the learned writer of this defence of the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy, and he quotes this instance at p. 7, as a proof of the bad condition of the Ionians at that time; an evidence, rather, it should be said, of the low condition of that party who would have betrayed their country, then as ever, to secure themselves the emoluments of office. It is by association with this old relic of Venetian rottenness that the officials of the English administration have brought the administration of the Ionian Islands into such disgrace throughout Europe.

That no change of system could operate either during this period or from thence up to 1817—the time of Sir T. Maitland's Constitution—is evident, because, although the French occupation of 1807 (by the Treaty of Tilsit) endured only until 1809 (with the exception of Corfu, which was not surrendered until 1814), nevertheless the Islands were under the administration of Colonel Callender, Sir Hudson Lowe, General Campbell, and other British officers, and thus it is fair to presume that the rights and due government of the people were, during that time, not diminished by the British governors, as they certainly were not either by the Russian or the French.

What, then, remains of the vaunted glorious gifts of Sir T. Maitland to the Ionians? His good government (of which anon): was that a novelty? The supremacy of the Greek Church? Had been given before. The absence of peculation? Certainly not. The use of our

native language? Sir T. Maitland caused it to cease; postponed it indefinitely; and it has even yet not returned, officially, into use.* The morality, the economy of the English administration—have *they* been so conspicuous? The internal peace, the commercial prosperity of the Ionian people—have they increased? But these are questions to be hereafter answered. Let us see, as Sir T. Maitland gave us none of these, what he did give, or rather what he took away.

He took away at one swoop our rights and liberties, our power of managing our own affairs and regulating our own expenses. He trebled our outgoings and quadrupled our taxes.

And he did all this, forsooth, for the very reason, because, that a special Treaty of the great Powers of Europe solemnly guaranteed that it should not be done; and because they said, in so many words, that it should not be done, he affirmed that they meant that it should be done!

Yes! This was Sir T. Maitland's inference in 1817; and this is the argument plainly and openly stated by

* See Sir Howard Douglas's despatch to Lord J. Russell, dated Corfu, 10th April, 1840. "I would here beg leave to call your lordship's attention to that part of Lord Stanley's despatch of April, 1833, in which he expresses his regret that Lord Nugent should have introduced this subject into his speech at the opening of the Ionian Parliament, for he could discover nothing so urgent (from 1816 to 1833!) in the question as to justify his bringing it forward until he had received instructions so to do." When these instructions will arrive depends, I should think, on the coming of the Greek calends, for in 1849 I find the Assembly addressing Sir H. Ward with a complaint of "the delays, either deliberate or through inertness, opposed to the ardent desires of the Ionian people, to see carried into effect the intent of the laws and the reciprocal communications between the powers of the State, and between them and the citizens, carried on by the use of the national language." The writer of "The Ionian Islands under British Protection" speaks, however, of the Greek language as if to endeavour to introduce it were like introducing the Irish language! (p. 47).

the writer of this pamphlet in 1851, which pretends to speak the voice of "*those who, thoroughly acquainted with the real merits of the case, feel it to be their duty towards the public functionary who has been calumniated, and still more towards their country, which has been insulted, to set forth clearly the whole truth*" (p. 3).

I should have thought, for my own part, that no greater insult could have been offered to Great Britain than the declaration that the whole of her policy towards this people was based on a lie, that it was altogether a trick and mockery, a delusion and a snare, got up by one, who did not hesitate to avow, "in his despatches to the Colonial-office (p. 20), *that many clauses and titles in the constitutional Charter were perfect nonsense; and had only been introduced for the purpose of amusing and delighting the Ionians, who, like all other Orientals, dearly love fine words and sounding names.*"

This is what the writer calls Sir T. Maitland's performing his task with "honour and loyalty" (p. 21),—"the clever political engine" (p. 17), "by which a troublesome opposition could at any time be quietly got rid of, simply by excluding the names of the restive Legislators from the list presented to the Electors for their *choice* of the future Assembly" (p. 19),—which "enabled him to exclude from the double list all his opponents,—to form an *obedient* Parliament" (p. 20),—an expedient worthy of the most acute and practical law-giver of ancient Greece (p. 20), (*i. e.* simply cheating!) "an Alcinous of the modern Coreyra!" (p. 16)

But this writer, who had "access to official documents," tells us that the Congress of Vienna "seemed almost to have forgotten the Ionian Islands." On the contrary, I must inform this little-knowing pedant, who, like too many of his scholars, is but half perfect in his history-lesson, that the Congress had not "forgotten the Ionians." Small as this people were, they were, never-

theless, from the first birth of their independence, an object of consideration to the great European Powers. The Treaty of Amiens, by Article IX., had carefully stipulated their independence, while the provident kindness of Russia, France, and Great Britain COMMITTED TO AN IONIAN the grateful task of drawing up what, from that very fact, I will venture to pronounce they intended, should be to all future ages the Charter of Ionian liberty and independence. This task was undertaken cheerfully by the illustrious Count John Capo d'Istrias, whose correspondence with the Senate of the Ionian Islands at the time (May 1814), now lies before me.

And here, indeed, it may not be uninteresting to set forth the masterly view, taken by the "Senate of the Seven Isles," of the occupation of the Ionian territory, during the various vicissitudes of the great European war that had been raging from 1793 to 1814,—a view as masterly in argument, as it is just in fact. After recording the military occupation of Russia and France, this state paper goes on to say:—

"England attacked and occupied some of the Islands, and although each State preserved its government and its laws, while the nation continued to be represented by its Senate, nevertheless, the republic and the nation necessarily were compelled to suffer the *bouleversements* inseparable in a state of war. But, whatever may have been the accidental influence of events, the Senate has never ceased to regard these different occupations of its territory as purely military, commanded by circumstances, and differing in no respect from the provisional measures taken, simultaneously, in the other parts of Europe. The Senate was always firmly persuaded that the war, once terminated, its territory would be, equally with that of other nations, evacuated and restored to it."
—*Public act of the Senate, dated Corfu, 21 May, 1814.*

The position here taken up by the Senate of the Seven Islands totally sets aside the argument founded on " conquest," so impudently set forth by this writer; an argument which I trusted to have sufficiently set aside for ever in a recent discussion in the public press.* The reply of Count John Capo d'Istrias to the Senate on this occasion is an historical document, the more valuable, in the present instance, as containing the opinion of the person who drew up the Treaty of Paris, and that of one of the Sovereigns who were a party to it, as to its object, and the intention and purport with which its stipulations should be construed.

"If anything," he says, "can render sweet the lot of a man, who lives far from his country, it is the happiness of working for her service, and the hope of meeting her applause. This sentiment, identified with my existence, has sustained me when I could be no longer among you. You have shown your appreciation of my feelings by your letter of the 21st May, 1814, which places under my charge the interest of our country. The Emperor of Russia, my generous master, has crowned all his other favours, by permitting me to fulfil your wishes, and also, at the same time, to act, at the Allied Congress, as the organ of the perpetual *bienveillance* of his Imperial Majesty towards our country. That country has required from the justice of this monarch the re-establishment of her political existence, which was the price of her own sacrifices, and of which events, foreign to herself, have deprived her. The Emperor and his August Allies have much satisfaction in restoring it to her.

"The Treaty, which I hasten to transmit to you, consecrates in a solemn manner this act of justice and of liberality. To restore to the Ionian people their nation-

* See in the *Times* newspaper of the 16th and 29th August, 1850, the Letters between "an Ionian" and Colonel Angelo.

ality and their laws, is to exercise towards them an act of justice.

“To guarantee to them the peaceable enjoyment of benefits so great, by placing the maintenance of the progress of their political regeneration under the auspices of a British Protection, is to associate their fortunes with the most eminent interests, and to assure to their happiness a long future.”*

That future, alas ! has never yet seen even its birth ; those interests have, as yet, been but one-sided !

The Count J. Capo d'Istrias goes on to speak of the “paternal solicitude of the British Protection,” as “a means of assuring the repose of the country, and gradually co-operating in the march of its civilization,” and of “the nation great and flourishing, as much from its liberal institutions as from its power,” which is to “guide the Ionians in their happy career.”

Here, then, we have the opinion of the statesman who drew up the Treaty (we shall come afterwards to the expressed opinions of the English statesmen who accepted it), and of the Sovereign, whose minister he was, at whose request, and under whose special instructions, as well as those of his countrymen, he acted at the Congress of Paris and Vienna. Now, let us hear what the representative of the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy says on this point, and how he attempts, by a chicanery of false reasoning and illogical conclusions, unworthy even an ordinary Member, much more a Rector, of an University, whether of Oxford or Corfu, to fritter away the obligations of a Solemn Treaty.

“The Treaty was really an agreement, made for the benefit of the Ionians, between Russia and Great Britain. The first article of this Convention gave the Seven Islands and their dependencies the title of a ‘Free and

* Remarks, &c., by Count Viaro Capo d'Istrias, p. 73. Appendix F.

Independent State;’ but its effect was *neutralised* by the provisions which followed. For it was further declared, that the Ionians were placed under the immediate and exclusive protection and military command of the British Sovereign, who was to be represented by a resident Lord High Commissioner, invested with authority to regulate the laws and general administration; the power of summoning a Constituent Assembly, and directing its proceedings in drawing up a Constitutional Charter. It was also stipulated, that the new form of government *should be founded on the political organization already existing*, and that it should be submitted to the ratification of the Protecting Sovereign.” (p. 10).

Now, I put it to any reader, whether the plain interpretation of this Treaty allows of any mystification of argument?

“The object of the Treaty” (I quote the words of Mr. Goulbourn, in reply to Mr. Hume, in 1821) “was, that the Ionian States should enjoy a Constitution, founded upon their former Constitution, *but with greater advantages to themselves.*” (Hansard, 1821, vol. v. p. 1140.)

The Treaty, then, provided that the existing liberties of the people should not be infringed. Were they not so? Let any impartial person compare the machinery and working of the two Constitutions, that of Russia and that of Sir T. Maitland. Well might an eminent Ionian scholar, philosopher, and statesman observe, “Would to God we could have that Constitution in force now!”

But, say the Bureaucracy, by this writer, “If we consider the mutual relations between Great Britain on one side, and the Ionian Islands on the other, *it is impossible to believe* that the Allied Powers, who were parties to the Treaty of Paris, did not intend, *or at any rate did not expect*” (ingenious subterfuge!) “that the Protectors would interpret it as giving them full authority to mould

the future destiny of the Protected. If the first article had stood alone, the appointment of a Lord High Commissioner would have been superfluous." The moral blindness of these Anglo-Ionians is such, that they suppose the Sovereigns of Europe to have intended as much cheatery, as they have practised themselves in regard to the Ionians. At first they used to deny this, but the practice of thirty years has so habituated them to the delusion, that they lose all shame, and come forth publicly by this pamphlet to deny and to defend it.

That such was not the intention of the Allied Powers, nor such the general understanding of the Treaty among Statesmen, is proved by the immediate remonstrance of Sir C. Monck, in the House of Commons, on the 21st of May, 1816, by the protest of Count J. Capo d'Istria, addressed to Lord Bathurst, in 1818, and 1819, and by the motions of Mr. Hume, on June 7, 1821, and May 14, 1822. By these it is clearly shown that neither did the friends of the Ionians accept this interpretation of the Treaty, nor did the framer of that Treaty allow it to be correct, nor did the Cabinet of Russia accede to it, nor did the Ionians themselves submit to it, except under the pressure of circumstances, I might almost say, actual force.

The argument of the writer, in respect to the Protection, is that of Sir T. Maitland; but the definition of a Protection is to be sought, not in the proclamations and addresses of 1817, but in 1800 and 1803; we there find the Turkish Government, whose *suzeraineté* was, as the writer acknowledges, but another name for Protection, which "vassalage," however, or Protection, from a non-christian power, the Ionians would not receive;—we find the Turkish Government, I say, guaranteeing to the Ionians, by Treaty, the independent management "of their political affairs," their internal Constitution, their commerce, and all other privileges, (Art. II., Treaty of 1800;)

the right of trading in the ports of the Ottoman Empire, under the direct action of their own Consul or vice-Consul; the Porte undertaking to *protect* the mercantile navy of the Ionian States from the corsairs of Tunis, Tripoli, and Algiers; (Art. III.). For this Protection the States were to pay 75,000 piastres (about £3,500) every three years, (Art. IV.), while Great Britain generously claimed £105,000 for the same period!! and even now extorts £75,000! (See Despatch from Earl Grey to Sir H. Ward, July 3, 1849, p. 121.)

The Porte also undertook, so great was the care of the independence of the States, by this Treaty, that its vessels of war should not approach within a certain distance (Art. VII.); while by the Constitution of 1800, as settled under that Treaty, the armed force, the finances, and the internal administration of the States, were placed entirely under the control of the Ionian Senate. Such was the definition of Protection under Turkey and Russia. It would not have been amiss, had Sir T. Maitland, when seeking for precedents of the relations between a Protecting Power and the Protected People, which he considered to be so unprecedented, reverted to these actualities of the Turkish Protection, which so strangely contrasts with that of England.

But the Christian faith of the Ionians would not allow them to submit themselves, even nominally, to the Turks; neither would their spirit of independence succumb to the aristocratic forms of government of the Senate alone, which was but a restoration of the Venetian plan of administration. Against the first, they carried on a guerilla warfare until they drove them from the Islands at once, and for ever; and of the other, they procured an alteration from Russia, which, now, at their request, assumed the position of Protecting Power.

Let us now see what was the Russian idea of Protection, as set forth in the Constitution of 1803. It estab-

lished the Greek faith as the national religion; gave protection to the Roman Catholic religion; and toleration to all others, (Art. 4); conferring the right of voting to the "nobility," it required from the Elector, (Art. 6), that he should be born in the Islands, of legitimate birth, and of the Christian faith; should possess an annual revenue, varying from 1,800 ducats in the larger islands, to 225 in the smaller; that he should not exercise, personally, any mechanical trade or keep open shop; should be able to read and write; be of good character; not a debtor to the public revenue, nor a fraudulent bankrupt; nor guilty of crimes punishable in a disgraceful manner. (*Despatch* from Lord Seaton to Earl Grey—Enclosure—Corfu, Jan. 4, 1849.)

A degree obtained at one of the principal Universities of Europe, the holder of such degree being a person of good repute, and living respectably by the exercise of his literary talents, or any liberal art, was considered equivalent to the annual rental required for nobility (Art. 7); and naturalization and nobility were (Art. 12) to be obtained, 1. by ten years' residence; 2. by signal service rendered to the State; 3. by the introduction of some useful art, scientific or mechanical; 5, by some great establishment for industry or commerce; or after five years' residence, naturalization only was to be obtained;—
1. By the possession of large landed property; 2. by extraordinary ability in science or art; 3. by marriage with an Ionian woman (Art. 13).

I may pause here to remark, that the people who had been possessed of such Constitution twelve years before Sir Thomas Maitland came amongst them, hardly deserved to be called barbarous, or set down as requiring to be educated for liberty and civilization by that "modern Alcinous," as I find noted in this pamphlet.

The Russian Protection, also, by this Constitution of

1803, gave the Vote by Ballot; the free election of a Representative Assembly, consisting of forty members; threw open all the offices of the State to the Ionians solely; instituted an Upper House of seventeen Senators, chosen by the Electoral Body, in whom vested the Executive Power of the State, foreign and domestic, and the management of the revenue and expenses, according as they might be settled by the Legislative Body.

This is the Constitution of which that of Sir T. Maitland, in 1817, is nothing but a parody, "a well-arranged and perfect whole, which he mutilated with his" clever machinery and tricky devices.

Such were the Turkish and Russian Protections. Where then was the difficulty to Sir T. Maitland in finding a precedent as to the method in which the Allied Powers had "intended" the Ionians should be treated? Could the Emperor of Russia, who had already filled the office of Protector,* entertain any doubt of the meaning of the word "Protection," in a Treaty drawn up by one of his own ministers, and actually under his own supervision? And that the interpretation of Sir T. Maitland was not intended to be put upon the Treaty is evident, as I have before said, from the language of remonstrance, addressed to Lord Bathurst, by Count J. Capo d'Istria, in 1818.

The writer argues, that "if the first article had stood alone, the appointment of a Lord High Commissioner would have been entirely superfluous." I do not myself see that a Lord High Commissioner is incompatible with a Constitution, any more than a Sovereign is with a Parliament; the more especially as I find an exact definition of the powers and description of duties of that office set forth in the Treaty itself, which,—after expressly stating, in Art. 3, that the United States

* See proclamation of Sir T. Maitland, Nov. 19, 1816.

shall, with the approbation of the Protecting Power, regulate their internal organization, goes on to specify the appointment of a Lord High Commissioner as being made.

“ In order to give to all the points of this organization the necessary consistency and action, for which purpose his Britannic Majesty will employ a particular solicitude with regard to the legislation and the general administration of these States.”

The Congress, however, showed themselves especially anxious to avoid that very interpretation being put upon this “ particular solicitude,” which it was the object of Sir T. Maitland to give it, and of this pamphlet to defend ; for, in Art. 4 we find the “ particular solicitude,” carefully restricted and defined as follows :—

“ In order to carry into execution, without delay, the stipulations mentioned in the articles preceding, and to ground the political reorganization of the united Ionian States upon that organization which is actually in force, the Lord High Commissioner shall regulate the forms of convocation of a Legislative Assembly, of which he shall direct the proceedings, in order to draw up a new Constitutional Charter for the States, which his Britannic Majesty shall be requested to ratify.”

This argument of the writer is founded on that used by Sir T. Maitland, in his address to his first Primary Council, a selection of his own creatures, called together by him to agree to his Constitution of 1817. He told them first, that, as the interests of the Protector and the Protected must be identical, that was the point of view from which the Treaty of Paris must be regarded. The first article, declaring the Ionian States independent, must, he said, be taken as modified by those which follow (so that the Treaty would first give independence, and then go on to take it away) ; and that the liberty and

independence of a State under Protection, must, in his opinion, be always problematical ; that the appointment of a Lord High Commissioner strengthened this view, as it placed the legislative and general administration in the hands of the Protecting Power—(or, in other words, he argued that, because it was determined by the Treaty that the Protecting Power should cause a Constitution to be drawn up, therefore it was meant that there should be no independence ; but he omitted to state that the Treaty enjoined that the Constitution should be founded on the basis and principles of the one then in existence). On this point, he declared he could not listen to any discussion. The Primary Council must adopt his view of the case and act upon it.*

But the method in which Sir T. Maitland started on his constitutional career, is best set forth in the admirable Memorial addressed to the Marquis of Normanby, on the 12th of August, 1839, by the Chevalier Mustoxidi, on which Memorial, though its immediate result was a strong reproof administered to its author by Lord J. Russell, at the instigation of Sir Howard Douglas, all the subsequent reforms and changes of the Ionian Constitution have been based.

“But, unluckily for the Ionian Islands (and to the shame of the British name be it said), the first Lord High Commissioner chosen to put in execution the Treaty, was a man of absolute and arbitrary principles. In vain the Treaty said to him, that the Ionian States were to remodel their internal organization on the basis of the one existing ; that he had nothing to do but to regulate the form for convoking the Legislative Assembly, and direct their proceedings in framing a Constitution, to be afterwards ratified by the King.

“In vain did the Treaty also tell him, that, until that

* Address of Sir T. Maitland to the Primary Council, February 3, 1817 : *Le tre Costituzioni*. Corfu, 1849, p. 144.

Constitution was ratified, the existing Constitution should remain in force, without any alteration (Arts. 3, 4, 5). In vain did he himself recognise the existence of a previous Constitution, and in consequence of that Constitution reinstate, in his place, the President of the Senate (Proclamation, 20th March, 1816); but he suddenly dissolved that Body, which he had found composed of Representatives from all the Islands, in the full exercise of their functions, and which had been recognised by his predecessor, General Campbell; and no sooner did the Senators address some remarks to him, than he, by a proclamation (22nd May, 1816), declared them to be unfit and corrupt citizens.

“ A measure so harsh and unexpected depressed every spirit. The English officers placed at the head of the Administration, in each island, intercepted all lawful means of forwarding the complaints of the Ionian people to the Protecting Power.

“ There existed an organic law of the Body of Electors. This law, by the Constitution of 1817, has been maintained to this day, except in that part where it received an arbitrary wound from Sir T. Maitland, in order to arrive at his deadly object. By this law, the Electors nominated the forty members of the Assembly, and the new organization ought, according to the Treaty, to have been based upon the one then existing, and to have remained unaltered until the ratification. But General Maitland created, by his own will, a Primary Council of eleven individuals, and proclaimed them an integral part of the future Assembly, and liberally gave them the right of nominating their other twenty-nine colleagues, leaving to the Electors only the miserable privilege of selecting, from a double list of names (and this not by an absolute, but by a relative majority), one out of each of the two names that only were proposed to them.

“ The false and ambitious views of these individuals,

their personal character, or their incapacity, were a sure pledge of the obedience that was required from them for the work in preparation."

These are the parties whom the writer of this pamphlet speaks of as the "most prominent and influential gentlemen." He tells us, that "Sir T. Maitland spent two years after his arrival in studying the character, &c." and that this Charter, "unanimously adopted," was the result. The contrary was the fact; Sir T. Maitland did no more than take the Constitution of 1803, tear out certain pages, as the Vote by Ballot, the freedom of election, and the self-government of the people; and then "invested himself with almost absolute authority" (p. 14). The Senate he made "little more than a Court to register the decrees of the Lord High Commissioner," whose approbation was necessary to every single act of the general government, the distribution of every farthing of the public money, to the appointment of every public servant from the highest to the lowest" (p. 15).

"Foreign relations, supreme military command, the direction of the Police, and the Health Departments were entrusted to him, immediately and exclusively" (p. 15). "He had a Resident in each of the Islands, to control their Local Governments, as he controlled the Senate at Corfu. Sir Thomas decided on creating himself virtually a Dictator" (p. 16). "The Alcinous of the modern Corcyra. He consults or signifies his wish to the Council of Chiefs and Elders. The Assembly hears and obeys, perhaps hears and murmurs, but is not expected to employ any option or power of rejection."

Such is the unmitigated nonsense, which a pedant politician, set over an Ionian University to direct the education of Ionian youth, thinks himself justified in giving forth to the world in defence of the shameless delusion and tyranny of Sir T. Maitland's administration.

With what feeling methinks must Ionian parents commit the education of their sons to such custody! With what spirit must the Ionian youth attend to the lectures and instructions of one who can speak of their country's rights and liberties in such terms! Well might Sir H. Ward find "schools without scholars," as we are told at p. 79, if such were the doctrines of the schoolmasters.

But this is not all. Let us have a further taste of the quality of a system, which this writer in defence of Sir H. Ward's policy sets forth with so much complacency as one that is so admirable, and to which, as he informs us, at p. 121, we must at once return. I will let him state his own account of what he regards as so laudable and just in his own terms. We have had his model Senate, let us now observe his model Assembly.

"The mainspring of this clever political engine" (the Constitution of 1817), "was the Primary Council, composed in the first instance of *eleven nominees of the Government*. On the expiration of each Parliament, the Senators and Regents constituted the new Primary Council and became the integral members—the nucleus—of the future Assembly. It was their duty to propose to the Electors a list of the persons *from whom alone* they were allowed to choose their other twenty-nine Representatives. This document, generally *framed under the direction of the Lord High Commissioners and their Secretaries*, was called the *double list*, as containing the names of twice as many (that is fifty-eight) candidates as there were places to be filled in the Assembly. As it always included a number of the most influential and respectable citizens, *known to be attached to England*" (by which the writer means the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy), "no difficulty was ever found in securing the return of those individuals whose presence in the Legislature was most desired by the Protection" (p. 78).

And yet they had the impudence to call such a system

re-election! And Sir T. Maitland did away with the vote by ballot to give "free and independent spirit to the Ionian Electors!"

But this is not all, "as the Primary Council was composed of the old Senators and Regents, and as the nomination of these functionaries virtually vested with the Lord High Commissioner, the Protecting Government *might have perfect confidence in the majority*, of its being always on its side under ordinary circumstances. But" (by way of making assurance doubly sure) "Sir T. Maitland vested in the English Privy Council the right to dissolve, at any moment, the Ionian Parliament. Thus, a troublesome opposition could at any time be quietly got rid of, simply by excluding the names of the restive Legislators from the list presented to the Electors for their choice of the future Assembly!"

This is the kind of political and social morality—this deliberate fraud and practical triple lie of government, and administration, and election,—which the Rector of a University dares in the present century to hold up for our approbation! This is "the expedient," which he tells us, "worthy of the most acute and practical law-giver of ancient Greece, provided a complete constitutional corrective to any spirit of opposition that could possibly arise."

I lose all patience when I think of this Solon; this so belauded legislator, "with his harsh but penetrating and commanding countenance" (p. 26); "this stern old soldier," this "Cromwell, who, though constantly and bitterly attacked, and seldom and coldly defended, is not unpopular with the great body of the people." It is notorious to us all, that the career of Sir T. Maitland, in the Islands, was that of an unrestrained tyranny. Released from all responsibility at home, he ruled the Ionians as he pleased, by turns a very "jolly" Alcinous or a stern Tiberius. His evening feasts were protracted

long into the morning, and the noonday found him yet sleeping off the fumes of last night's wine; he would receive the Senate in his nightcap, just as he had tumbled from his bed, and be heard to curse their untimely intrusion as they were waiting in his antechamber. We do not hear of the frequent inebriation of Alcinous as a portion of his wisdom; but often, when Sir T. Maitland was not to be seen for three or four days, "the larger portion of the men of substance and intelligence in the country" might be heard quoting the proverb—

"Una buona ubbriacatura
Quattro lunghi giorni dura."

His policy was a strong one indeed; for it was that of a man who had no control of his temper, and who did as he liked, because he knew that, by his own Constitution, no one could forward a complaint of him but through himself! He passed his time in journeying between Corfu and Malta, where he had another Governorship, charging the country the expenses of his voyages in his nephew's vessel; he was a place-holder of greedy desires and enormous voracity, to the extent of, I believe, £15,000 per annum;* and he finally died of apoplexy, at Malta.

This is the Solon, the Lycurgus, and the Draco, of whose practical, and especially moral administration of the Ionian Islands, I shall have a few words to speak in another part.

After so luminous an exposition of a Government so excellently contrived, the enthusiastic Rector loses all command of his feelings in his intense admiration of this Maitlandish Utopia, and breaks out with the following ingenious remark.

"This character of the Government vastly simplifies the labours of those who undertake to write on Ionian

* See Mr. Hume's speech on "the Ionian Islands." Hansard, May 14, 1822.

affairs. *Elsewhere*, history is the biography of societies ; *here*, it is the biography of Lord High Commissioners." Truly it has been so with the Ionians—Maitland, and Douglas, and Ward, taxation, tyranny, extravagance, debt, and sanguinary cruelty ! Nugent and Seaton—justice, generosity, liberty, retrenchment, and peace ! Let my English reader, however, imagine the fate of a nation depending on the disposition and temper of the person sent to govern it ; and not on laws, regulations, or Constitution ; "can such things be," he would say, "and this too in a country whose independence was guaranteed by a solemn Treaty of the great Powers of Europe, and placed under the safeguard of the British Protection ?"

I am sorry the learned Rector was not born a slave, as he would have so loved to lick his fetters, and shake them to some harmonious "God save our noble floggers !" in praise of the Sir Thomas, who lashed his lazy hide in some Carolinian sugar-plantation. Right pleasant and humorous withal is it to view this learned Theban, cane in hand, as each separate "whack" descends from his pedagoguish shoulder, with pitiless pedantry, on the youthful Ionian liberty, which he is training up in the way it should go ! Right pleasant, I say, is it to find him, page after page, telling us how thankful we ought to be,—we—who have lived through the suzeraineté of the Turks and the Protection of the Russians,—that we had fallen into the merciful hands of that jovial and well-salaried "Alcinous," Sir T. Maitland. Great is he also, when he tells us how that worthy Courier of the Ægean, that Colossus with one leg in Malta and the other in Corfu, "executed his important charge with honour and fidelity" (p. 21) ; despising "vague or foolish ideas of Republican Governments, or Greek rights and nationality" (p. 21) ; and how, as "the national honour of England was deeply implicated in the establishment of a good government in the Ionian Islands," he declared, worthy soul !—"that the

honour of their country was held by the majority of Englishmen to be of more vital consequence than any acquisition, however desirable, or any commercial advantage, however great"* (p. 18).

How beautiful is this clear, unadulterated humbug in high places! This illustrious SHAM! The "national honour" was exemplified in a series of cheating tricks; the loyalty and fidelity, in robbing a people of their just liberty; the Lord High Commissioner looking his Ionian victims in the face all the time, with a benevolent smile, with all the ingenuous simplicity, the innocent unconsciousness of a clever pickpocket, while robbing some polite old lady of her quarter's dividends in an omnibus!

Our Ionian "Rector" enjoys the massacre of our infant liberties, with the appetite of a Herod. He seems to think that "the constant and firm authority, and the securing public order and prosperity" (p. 12), were to be obtained by no other means, and applauds the manner in which all the Ionian situations were filled up by Englishmen, because, forsooth, "until the Ionians should have been trained to the acts and usages of a regular government, it was absolutely necessary to place a few experienced Englishmen at the head of the administration of justice, of the finances, and the police" (p. 24). But he forgets, with all his "access to official papers" (which I observe he has largely used to transfer, bodily, numerous passages of Sir T. Maitland's addresses, proclamations, &c. as parts of his own argument), to tell us, how Sir T. Maitland found the number of public situations, on his assuming office, to be 396, and how he at once increased them to 575; neither does he mention what Mr. Hume mentions (Hansard, vol. vii. 1822, in the Debate of May 14), and, what is notorious from the Parliamentary Returns of that period, about the ten Militia officers, who were flying about the Islands, at salaries varying from £200 to £400

* Address of Sir T. Maitland to the Primary Council, Feb. 3, 1817.

per annum, at the expense of the Ionian States,—all of them English officers “with allowances from the Ionian stores,”—when there was not one single Militia man, serjeant, or drummer for them to command: a gross and wicked job, perpetrated by this jolly Alcinous, and slurred over without defence in the English House of Commons, —in the same manner as Sir H. Ward’s atrocious cruelties in Cephalonia were last year defended,—not by denial of the fact, but on account of his “excellent character and disposition!” The “gallant officer” and “his talents and experience,” with other such polite phrases, served to extenuate, wipe out, and cover even the gross job I before mentioned, of his charging the English nation with the expenses of his voyages to Malta (whither he went to receive his own salary). Yet, in the face of all these notorious facts, patent as the noonday, and openly acknowledged,—now that no one is supposed to have an interest in their concealment,—this time-serving scholar, who doubtless has greased his gown at many a Government House dinner, tells us,—in a paragraph, which I will back for falsehood against the aggregated epitaphs of a thousand churchyards, that—“When, in the spring of 1849, another English officer” (the writer here refers to Lord Seaton, and here the *animus* of the whole pamphlet first peeps out)—

“Yielded up to the cries of a few demagogues the system which had ensured thirty years of peace (!) and prosperity (!), unparalleled in the annals of the Islands (!), and which was long and generally considered, whatever might be its faults, as a necessary guarantee of social order; all who were at Corfu will bear witness, that many an honest heart among the Ionian gentry swelled with respectful remembrance of the stern old soldier, who, if he sometimes handled them rudely himself, took care that no one else should presume to treat them ill.”

Sir T. Maitland, with all his faults, might still have lain unquestioned in his grave; but that such writers as this will overdo their dirty work, and drag the rottenness of

his bad fame into open daylight, and call upon us to admire the eternal sweetness of a good man's memory.

Not content, however, with filching from the Ionians their liberties, Sir T. Maitland, as I am prepared to show, actually picked our pockets of our money. In that "very able, candid, and manly address" (p. 11), in which, as M. Mustoxidi expresses it (Memorial, p. 8. par. 23), he "ordered that all persons of different opinions should keep them to themselves, and declared he should abstain from all discussion on this point, all of which would be useless, since he would suffer no interpretation, but the one he thought proper to give,"—in this "very able, candid, and manly address," the Lord High Commissioner exhibited a remarkable consideration as to handling the money of the Ionians, when he spoke as follows:—

"As regards the finances of these countries, we might, were Great Britain disposed to insist on the letter of the Treaty, exact from you a Convention for the payment of our troops and the support of our garrison. But from a consideration of the condition of the States, and the disorder of their finances, and that the whole system of internal administration must be changed entirely before any knowledge of the means of the State can be acquired, the Protection will be satisfied with reducing the expenses of each Island into the smallest possible limits, and paying the surplus into the general public treasury, to be applied to such useful works as may be required, and the repair and preservation of the fortresses." (Address to the Primary Council, 3rd November, 1817.)

After this, will it be believed that Sir T. Maitland, raised the taxes on the people from £48,500 to £87,420, and spent more than £200,000 on fortresses? nay more, that, — after all the boasted generosity of the Protection, — he made the Assembly pass a law to pay £35,000 yearly for the expense of British troops to garrison the Islands; and that Great Britain, up to the last few years, has had the meanness to accept it? The very last published despatch of Earl Grey, as I have before shown, still further insists on this payment, now re-

duced to £25,000, because my poor countrymen cannot pay any more.

Now, what are the words of this Convention, which has cost the Ionians so dearly, and what its true meaning?

“That his Britannic Majesty consented that a particular Convention with the Ionian States should settle all matters relating to the garrisons, both as to number and expense.”

This is all; and it certainly never was meant that the Ionian States should pay for three regiments, where Russia had found one sufficient for every Ionian purpose. The fact of the importance of the Ionian Islands as a garrison for British purposes in the Adriatic, was no reason why the Ionians should have been made to pay for it.

“Of course,” argues Mr. Hume (in his speech of May 14, 1822), “the meaning of the contemplated arrangement must have been that the settlement should take place with those constitutional authorities, in conformity with the stipulation, that all expenses were to be defrayed by the revenues of the islands; therefore clearly implying, that there was to exist a civil and independent government, separate and distinct from the military authorities.”

This view of the separate functions of the civil and military government of the Ionian States, as intended by the Treaty of Paris to devolve the *first* upon the Ionians themselves, and the *second* on the Protecting Power, as well as the universal opinion of the statesmen of England, then and since, as to the real position of Great Britain in these States, it will be easy to corroborate, first by a quotation from the State paper, entitled, “Observations sur l’état intérieur des Iles Ioniennes, Nov. $\frac{10}{22}$, 1815,” addressed to Lord Castlereagh, and in explanation of his views, with which Count John Capo d’Istrias accompanied the copy of the Treaty drawn up by himself; secondly, by the public observations of those statesmen, at that time and subsequently, both in the debates in Parliament and their despatches, as well as by the remonstrance afterwards addressed to Lord Bathurst at the instance of

the cabinet of Russia, by the Count J. Capo d'Istria against the violation of the Treaty of Paris.

The advice given by that statesman, himself an Ionian, as to the right method of government for the Ionians, was as follows :—

“ The Protecting Power, in deigning to extend a paternal solicitude to the legislation and the government of the Ionian Islands, ought not, in any case, to permit its agents to take an immediate part in the making of the laws or the administration of the country.

“ A formal exercise of these rights would destroy the *prestige* of the national existence of the Islands, wound the self-love of the natives, deprive the general cause of the co-operation of the most distinguished men, and cause all the responsibility of the administration to fall on the shoulders of the foreigners who administered affairs. These individuals, the most greedy after ephemeral advantages (and every country has its own) would make an exclusive profit for themselves, to the detriment of the country, and to the damage of the reputation of the Protecting Power.

“ The legislation of the government of the Islands should be exclusively confided to the Ionians, the Protecting Power taking care to assure itself, in a real and positive manner, that the Legislature and those engaged in the government have no other object, no other intention, in carrying out the duties of their offices than that of consolidating the prosperity of their country.

“ The Protecting Power could exercise this advantageous influence.

“ 1. By directing the Legislative Assembly in its operations.

“ 2. By accepting from it the right of appointment to the principal offices of the general administration, on which depends the particular administration of each island, as well as to the judicial tribunals.”

Such was the scheme of the duties and objects of a Protecting Power, and the means of carrying them out, which were set forth for Sir T. Maitland. But he shut his eyes to this, declared he could not see it, and acted just the contrary. The result has been a never-ending contest during thirty years between the Ionian liberals and the Bureaucracy, and finally such a remodelling of his so-called Constitution, as, thanks to the subsequent tinkering interference of Sir H. Ward, has conceded to the Ionians too little for the full enjoyment of liberty, and just too much of self-government to permit any longer

the uncontrolled exercise of an arbitrary power by the Lord High Commissioner.

The author briefly sums up the next 20 years of Ionian history by informing us that "Sir Frederick Adam and Sir Howard Douglas carefully walked in the footsteps of their predecessor."

How Sir F. Adam carried on his government can be judged from the account of his administration which Sir Charles Napier has left us, in his "Colonies,"* and the utter absorption of the national revenues by which it was distinguished. It is now ten years since I briefly summed up the history of Sir Howard Douglas's tyranny in a letter which I felt it my duty to address to him at that period, 1842, and from which I now subjoin an extract.

"You have been the representative of British freedom, British policy, British power and will, to aid in the advance and development of liberal institutions in every nation under her sway or protection. As Lord High Commissioner of the Queen of England, you presided over a people, few indeed in numbers, but characterised by talent, acumen, and energy; and who, without reference to their heroic or historic times, can show, within the last century, a longer catalogue of eminent men, in proportion to the population of their country, than any other nation in Europe, or indeed all the rest of Europe together. Yes, Sir, the Ionian Islands, which hardly equal in population a single parish in London, have produced a long and noted series of divines, philosophers, statesmen, orators, warriors, professors, &c.; nor will it be irrelevant to my present purpose to mention a few of them, such as *Mignati*, *Theotoky*, *Bulgari*, *Eugenious*, learned divines preachers and distinguished writers; *Bondioli*, *Delladecima*, *Carburi*, *Pieri*, *Foscolo*, professors of the first universities of Italy and elsewhere; another, *Carburi*, a great architect, who transported to St. Petersburg the granite rock on which stands the statue of Peter the Great; *Lusi*, a general in Prussia, and ambassador in England; *Loverdo*, a general and peer of France; *Corafin*, viceroy of Sicily; *Jerachi*, viceroy of Siam; *Moncenigo*, *Bulgari*, *Franzini*, ministers of state in Europe; *Capo d'Istrias*, secretary of state in Russia, plenipotentiary of that power in the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, and President of Greece; and there are many others of great

* The Colonies, and the Ionian Islands in particular. London: Boone. 1833.

merit, though perhaps of less renown, the enumeration of whose names would fill many pages.

“Over this people, entrusted to the protection of the Queen of England by a solemn European Treaty, you have, as the representative of British Majesty, held unrestricted sway for more than six years; and it is this people, Sir, whom, in your despatch of the 10th of April, 1840, when they had for five years been subjected to the influence of your government, and had, for twenty-five years, been under British Protection, you declare to be ‘uneducated, fanatical, and superstitious,’ their enlightened clergy ‘ignorant and bigoted,’ the whole nation ‘semi-barbarous and unprepared to receive the institutions promised to them by that solemn Treaty.’ You represent them as ‘unfit for a press, even with moderate restrictions, and to be incapable of investigating or regulating the accounts and expenditure of their own finances.’ And more than all this, you stigmatize them as ‘factious, corrupt, and enemies to the British Protection!’

“Many eminent Ionians, amongst whom are Count Vlaro Capod’Istrias, Dr. Plessa, Mr. Petrizzopulo, &c., have expressed their indignation at this libel on their country, in several pamphlets, published in London and elsewhere; but one of the most distinguished among them, one of the first scholars and most talented men of his age, a man not of Greek or Ionian, but of European reputation, the Chevalier Andrea Mustoxidi, has charged me now with the distribution, amongst some of the most eminent men in London, of a pamphlet written by him in reply to the said despatch of the 10th of April, 1840, and in defence of his country.

“Though I do not find your name in the list for distribution, I should consider it a want of courtesy on my part, not to forward you a copy of the work, as your name figures in almost every page, and your statements in that despatch are, without a single exception, completely contradicted and refuted. I feel it, therefore, incumbent on me to forward you a copy, and I embrace the opportunity to convey to you a suggestion, to which I request your most serious attention.

“The production in the House of Commons of the above mentioned despatch, together with the memorial of the Chevalier Mustoxidi, took place in June 1840, and in April of the following session a Committee of Inquiry was demanded by the friends of the Ionians, to examine into the truth of the statements of that despatch. Through the influence, however, of your friends and supporters in the House, and the unwillingness of Lord John Russell himself to doubt the correctness of an official document, his lordship joined your friends, and the Committee was refused. Truth, however, has a vitality and vigour not to be subdued or repressed by factious opposition; neither can the devices of art for ever withstand the persevering constancy of its attacks. The triumph of truth was delayed for a while by the

rejection of the motion of Lord Charles Fitzroy for a Committee of Inquiry, but only for a while ; for the Chevalier Mustoxidi has now supplied, by his individual and patriotic exertions, the direct and complete refutation of the statements in your forenamed despatch, which must have resulted from the parliamentary inquiry, had it been granted. In the pamphlet which I now send you, you will find that the Chevalier Mustoxidi has taken up your despatch, paragraph by paragraph, passage by passage, statement by statement, has calmly and clearly demonstrated their total want of foundation, and has passed upon it the sentence which would inevitably have been pronounced had its merits been tried, as was proposed, by a Committee of your own countrymen."

The reply of Sir Howard Douglas to my letter was conveyed to me through his son, Major Douglas, who returned the pamphlet, and informed me of Sir Howard Douglas's determination to decline all correspondence or communication with me on the subject, upon which I printed the correspondence and circulated it amongst the members of the English Legislature, with a note, of which the following is an extract.

" By the return of the pamphlet, Sir H. Douglas has driven me to an appeal from himself to his colleagues in the British Parliament, who, however they may be inclined to advocate those principles in which Sir Howard professes to have conducted his government, would be far from giving countenance to the tyrannical and arbitrary means by which he carried out his administration. Dilapidation of the State's finances, as proved by an uncontradicted article in the 'Morning Chronicle' of the 11th of February, 1841, and by many writers, amongst whom is Count Capo d'Istria; dissolution of an Assembly characterised by talent, patriotism, and independence, and the substitution of another, most of the members of which had no pretence to such attributes, but whose preponderating virtue was submissive obedience to the will which created them legislators;—wholesale calumnies, persecutions, arbitrary imprisonments, domiciliary visits, banishments without trial, denial of a free press, interference in the religious observances of the people, never before attempted, not even under Latin intolerance, during the time of the Venetians; the subsequent hostility to the Greek Patriarch, unfortunately too successful; the encouragement given to missionaries to spread their doctrines among the people, which had for its result the late fatal collision between the mob and the soldiers; the treating of a free people like Helots, and other measures of a similar nature, are not so congenial to the

English character as to admit of their being tolerated or passed over in silence, if once brought under the notice of the British Parliament. After this, Sir Howard Douglas may get up in his place, and talk of the happiness he has conferred on the Ionian people; but he may be assured that there will rise up from that Parliament of which he is now a member, some generous champions, to demand from him an account of his administration in those islands, an administration which has rendered the British name unpopular through the Levant, and almost annihilated that affection which had always subsisted between the Ionian people and their protectors."

That the slight sketch of Sir Howard Douglas's financial administration, which I have here given, is by no means incorrect, is proved in the subjoined letter from Lord Charles Fitzroy to Lord John Russell, which his lordship subsequently printed in a pamphlet, entitled: "Letters and Documents on the Ionian Islands."*

"Burlington House, April 15, 1842.

"DEAR LORD JOHN,

"I have just been reading the Lord High Commissioner's (Lord Seaton's) first speech to the Ionian Legislative Assembly, which speech fully bears out the justice of the complaints of the Ionians against the financial administration of Sir Howard Douglas.

"Notwithstanding that the revenue over former periods had increased, yet had the expenditure increased so much, that from 1835 to 1840 the *expenditure* exceeded the *revenue* by a sum of £19,000. In 1841-42, the gross revenue was £150,446; expenditure £154,292; leaving in that year a deficit, as to revenue, of nearly £4,000. The above is Lord Seaton's own statement, and he follows it up by saying, "Annunzio solamente i fatti, astenendomi da ogni ragionamento ulteriore,"—a pretty severe slap for Sir Howard Douglas; the present Lord High Commissioner (Lord Seaton) being served by the same Council that his predecessor had been.

"To this excess of expenditure is to be added sums borrowed from the pension fund, &c. &c., arrears for the military contributions unpaid and unaccounted for.

"I had nearly forgot to mention the surplus revenue left by Lord Nugent, likewise unaccounted for; making, in the whole, nearly £300,000. All this, and much more, would have come out, if a Committee for Inquiry had been granted to me.—Yours very truly,

"*Rt. Hon. Lord John Russell,*

"CHARLES FITZROY."

&c. &c. &c."

* London: Ridgway. 1850.

The government of Lord Nugent, which, we are told, "was too short to leave any lasting traces," left at any rate in the treasury £126,550 sterling. Every penny of which, in spite of a constantly increasing revenue, Sir Howard Douglas, who succeeded him, managed to consume. He left to his successor, Mr. Stuart Mackenzie, sufficient occupation for years in quieting the agitation, and discontent and terror, which his tyrannical despotism had produced in the minds of the Ionians.

We may now pause to examine, with this pamphleteering pedagogue, "the practical results of the English domination during the preceding twenty-five years." "A good government," our author tells us, "like a good coat, is that which suits the body for which it is designed." Granted—but who is the proper judge of its fitting and its fitness, the tailor or the wearer? The Constitution-monger or the people who have to live under his "system"? Let us examine these "blessings" more closely.

"At home piracy and brigandage disappeared." The contrary is the fact; up to the independence of Greece, which now guards its opposite shores, the islands Meganesi and others, for instance, were infested with pirates, as was the Archipelago. What has been done as regards brigandage is shown by the acknowledged fact, recorded in the despatches of Sir H. Ward, that though there were 700 soldiers in Cephalonia, yet even with these and the assistance of the police, Theodore Vlacco, a notorious brigand, was enabled to remain at liberty for upwards of six months, and was only finally taken when he had gathered a sufficient band together, with the "Father Robber," Nodaro, to make himself dangerous.

"Abroad, the Ionians became entitled to the same protection which British subjects received from all English Consuls and Missions." They might have been "entitled," but they certainly never got it, unless on such occasions as that of the late Pacifico affair, when it served the

purpose of my Lord Palmerston to interest himself on behalf of a persecuted Ionian burglar and his man, by way of making up a grievance against the Government of Greece. The complaints of the Ionians at Constantinople are too well known at the Foreign-office, as vainly demanding redress, to require my further mention of them here.

But "trade and agriculture flourished." Did they so? What say the despatches of Lord Seaton, which tell us of his labours to encourage and reanimate it? Let us hear what the Assembly said to Sir H. Ward on this subject.

"Our marine, formerly flourishing, is now decreasing; agriculture and industry are not animated or protected." (*Speech of the President of the Assembly to the Lord High Commissioner, on the 11th of April, 1850, published with the unanimous consent of the Assembly.*)

"Justice was for the first time administered with rigour and impartiality." Indeed! What does the Rector think of the following case, as stated publicly in the House of Commons, by Mr. Hume, on June 7, 1821?—

"He pledged himself, if the House granted a Committee to inquire, or sent out a Commission to take evidence (though that was hardly necessary, for the official documents themselves proved enough to support the general accusation), to prove such a system of misrule as must excite the indignation of every good man, and he could only, if his motion should be refused, appeal to the House, as a witness of his endeavour to prevent the disastrous consequences of rebellion and civil war, which must ensue in these islands, if Sir T. Maitland was allowed to act the tyrant. To convince the House of the truth of his statement, he would now mention another case, that of Valerio Stai, who was suspended from the responsible situation he filled, without inquiry, and refused every opportunity of justifying his conduct, although by the Constitution he was entitled to have his case carried before the public tribunal. There was another cruel and arbitrary act towards Signor Alessandro Battaglia, who was the inheritor of church abbey lands, which had for a long course of years been in his family. The estate had been duly conferred by an abbot 150 years before. This man loudly complained of the revision of his title to this property, and demanded that the matter might be legally investigated before the regular judicial tribunals. At length Sir T. Maitland determined that the matter should be referred to two natives and two Englishmen. The state of things in the islands was such, that the whole four were

under the influence of the governor. The parties, however, did not concur eventually in opinion, for two were for referring the case to the lower tribunal, and two for the adoption of a different course. The equality of voices led to the introduction of Sir T. Maitland's opinion as umpire, and he, in an elaborate letter, dated the 12th of April, 1820, filling several pages and containing the most extraordinary view of the whole case, decided against the complainant, upon the authority of an Act passed by the Senate of Venice, in the year 1412, which declared that church property was inalienable. In vain did the complainant urge the length of time during which this property had been in the possession of his family; in vain did he point out that, when they got it, the land was uncultivated, and that it had been made productive by the application of their own capital and industry. Nothing could be more flagrant than the act of injustice which had deprived this man of his property. Such conduct ought not to be tolerated in any governor. Sir Thomas Maitland, who had been long in India, ought to have recollected the scrupulous care which was taken by British governors in the East, to protect the natives from any wanton attack upon their rights of property, or upon their habits or religious principles. The same proper and politic delicacy ought to have marked his conduct towards the inhabitants of the Ionian Islands. It would be endless to travel over all the acts done by the governor contrary to the spirit of the British Constitution, in open violence of those equitable rules which ought to have regulated his conduct towards the people over whom he had been appointed to preside."

"In the most wanton and unjustifiable manner, one of the richest and most respectable inhabitants of the island, whose name was Martinengo, was seized by armed men in the middle of the night in his bed, his papers and property bundled together in the greatest confusion, while he himself was hurried on board one of his Majesty's frigates, and transported to Corfu, where he was kept in close confinement. Nothing could equal the violence and hardship to which this gentleman had been wantonly exposed. He had taken no part whatever in the disturbances, and yet, in defiance of all propriety and law, this was the treatment he had endured; all his memorials and remonstrances, notwithstanding his rank at Zante, being utterly disregarded; he protested against the tribunal, and demanded to be tried by the court established by the Constitution. He was tried and condemned, contrary to every existing law, on the plea that the old laws of Venice permitted such proceedings. The sentence was as harsh and unjustifiable as the previous proceeding was cruel and unprecedented. He was doomed to twelve years' imprisonment in the Island of Santa Maura, which, considering his advanced age of sixty-six, and the unhealthy nature of the place of his confinement, might be regarded as

imprisonment for life. His Majesty's ministers, he (Mr. Hume) had heard, lately had seen the injustice of the sentence, and changed it to three years' exile in any part of Europe not in his Majesty's dominions. But to suppose that this high-minded man would accept of such terms of clemency, without the power of clearing his character, or justifying his conduct, was to show a total ignorance of his resolution and his principles. To show the unhealthiness of the place of his present confinement, he (Mr. Hume) had merely to state, that he had heard that, before he was there, out of a regiment of 700 men, 450 were on the sick list. The honourable gentleman went on to state the hardships of those who had signed petitions to the Government at home, for instituting inquiries into the late disturbances, and who had in consequence been arrested and thrown into prison, though the Constitution expressly guaranteed the privilege of presenting such petitions. Thirty-two persons were in this predicament. Another body of fifty had presented a petition to Colonel Ross (Sir T. Maitland's Resident in Zante), and were in a similar manner arrested and punished. One of them, who was a member of the Legislature, had been degraded, and was to be tried for high treason, while Signor Rossi, who was a magistrate, and who had signed the first petition, had likewise been degraded and ordered for trial."

Such was the "Justice" administered in the Ionian Islands in the times of Sir T. Maitland, and Sir H. Douglas in every respect followed his example, while the present policy of Sir Henry Ward, it must be said, is a combination of both with the addition of great cruelty.

"The Ionians," says our author, "learned to cultivate arts unheard of in the preceding generations." Is it so? What evidence have we of them? Is it in the letter of the Royal Commissioners, in which they inform me that Sir H. Ward had declined any space for the Ionians in the Great Exhibition of the Arts and Industry of the World, for 1851? *

"Excellent roads, hitherto unknown in the East, were constructed through all parts of the country." This is not the fact. Sir F. Adam took care that all the money for roads should be expended on those about the seat of

* See Appendix A.

government at Corfu. On this point I must refer the reader to General Sir Charles Napier's work, which gives the evidence of his own time and experience.

"Numerous schools of primary and secondary instruction were supported in all the islands, while the University established at Corfu, and long presided over by that generous friend of Greece, the late Earl of Guilford, became the chief seat of education for the whole Greek race." Myself a grateful *protégé* of Lord Guilford, and brought up by him for a Professorship in that University, I am, unfortunately, able to contradict, in the strongest terms, this assertion of the "Rector of the University." Hardly was the University opened, when it met, on all sides, from Sir T. Maitland himself, and the parties about him, a shower of ridicule, and a vehement opposition. On the day of the Battle of Navarino, the memorable 20th of October, 1827, Greece may be said to have won her independence, but lost a Protector; for while the battle was fighting in that glorious bay, Lord Guilford was expiring in London. From that time the University was discouraged, and consequently became deserted.

But let us hear the most illustrious of our scholars, the Chevalier Mustoxidi; what says he on this point in his Promemoria, (p. 12, par. 84, 85, 87, 89) referring to so late a period as 1840?

"One of the first duties of Parliament, dictated by the Constitution, after the royal ratification, was the establishment of a College for the different branches of science, belles-lettres, and the fine arts. Has this been done? Certainly not. Acts of Parliament, resolutions, reports, and regulations, are published in succession, for the purpose of reorganizing public instruction, but each one of the enactments destroys the other. * * * * What a picture for a University, which has 40 students, and whose professors are compelled to remain inactive and silent from 1840 until 1844, because the (new) regulation deprives them of hearers!—What a picture of intermediate schools, where one seeks in vain for even a globe or an atlas! * * * * Eleven thousand pounds are squandered, and the Ionian youth flock to foreign univer-

sities to pursue their studies. And the elementary schools? They are deserted. An inspector of these and of the secondary schools has been appointed, for the sole purpose of conferring a situation on a Baptist Missionary; a man ignorant of our character, our habits, our religious rites, and our language, is appointed to superintend the education of the rising generation. * * * The national self-love is wounded, the conscience of the people disturbed."

The Church—this has evidently not been too well taken care of, in spite of the boasting of Sir T. Maitland's care in this respect, at p. 22, if we are to believe our author at p. 29? "We trust that the State will finally learn the necessity and justice of providing more amply for the Church as its property was sequestered under the French, and has been in part iniquitously plundered." What says our author to the attack on the Greek Church by Sir Howard Douglas's codes, in which he attempted to alter the canons of marriage, and was so irritated at the Patriarch's having published a volume of pastoral letters, instructions, and other acts relative to it, that he caused him to be deposed by the Sultan, as the head of a Philorthodox conspiracy against England! (which conspiracy had only existence in his own brains). Thus showing his respect for the Greek Church in the Ionian Islands by degrading its head.*

"The Government revenue was free from peculation and carefully regulated (p. 29); during more than thirty years not a single instance of peculation has been even suspected by a most suspicious people." (p. 36). What then was the story of Colonel Robinson?

The Rector has omitted to set before us the excellent example of morality shown to us by our English Governors. The double divorce of a General and a Colonel, and other instances of profligacy in high places too painful for detailed notice.

Warming with his subject, and floundering through the

* Remarks, &c., by Count Viaro Capo D'Istrias. London: T. Brettell. 1841. P. 34.

mire of falsehood into the haze of enthusiasm, the writer breaks out into a glaring description of Ionian happiness under British Protection.

“With the exception of trifling fees for stamps, harbour-dues, and the like, they pay no taxes whatever, except on their imports and exports. Few men of candour will deny that the British rule is a good one to live under, particularly where it can be enjoyed without the evils that attend it at home—heavy taxation and wide-spread pauperism. While his life and property are more secure than they would be in many parts of the British islands, the Ionian peasant, or landowner, consumes the fruit of the earth without contributing one farthing towards the expenses of the government. In these happy little communities, the visit of the tax-gatherer is unknown. The public revenue averages £150,000 yearly, and this sum covers both the general and municipal expenses of the State.”

Brave words these! But how stand the facts as we find them from indisputable official sources? The Islands do not grow corn, and up to Lord Seaton's time their very bread was heavily taxed. No business transaction can take place, no petition be presented, no step whatever made towards an official person, unless *upon stamped paper*. The staple produce of the people, oil and currants, pays an export duty of 19½ per cent., with about 3 per cent. additional for roads and other municipal expenses; while the intervening seas, which form, as it were, the highways of the Islands, are stopped after the method of a turnpike-gate, at each harbour by transit duties, which tax the commodities of every name and description* interchanged between island and island. So far from there being no pauperism in these “happy little communities,” the complaints from neighbouring Greece are frequent of that continuous importation, immigration, and deportation, of beggars and vagrants from Cephalonia, which have

* Let the reader cast a glance at Appendix F, and he will then be astonished at the impudent falsehood of that assertion on the part of the Rector of the Ionian University, who, “having access to official documents,” can thus, in the face of them, assert that “we pay no taxes whatever.”

rendered Pyrgos, as shown in the late monstrous Blue Books on Greece, a perfect St. Giles'. The public revenue certainly averages £150,000 yearly, and of this the Protection carries off £25,000 yearly, and the Lord High Commissioner and his list £15,000 (now reduced to £13,000), while, for fifteen years, "the general and municipal expenses of the State" have averaged £14,000 annually beyond the receipts, entailing, among other advantages to this "happy little community," the blessing of a National Debt. Every Englishman knows what it is to live under British rule in the colonies, where, up to within the last few years, almost every governor was as much a despot as a captain of a frigate on his quarter-deck, and therefore we can have little difficulty in imagining how "good to live under" was the British rule in the Ionian Islands. Of this, however, our author himself, in his candour, furnishes us with a few instances.

As to the conduct of the British Employés.—

"It must be confessed, indeed, that our countrymen are not invariably famous for their skill in conciliation. Certain of the gentlemen formerly invested with the authority of Residents, have played in past years very fantastic tricks in some of the southern islands. And they have been, nearly without exception, officers on half pay, utterly ignorant of the language, manners, and feelings of the little communities, over which they exercised almost despotic sway. Then, also, some of the Englishmen, to whom the revenue departments were entrusted, have been overbearing in manner, though most honest and unflinching in discharge of their duties." (P. 36.)

A pleasant state of things this, certainly, for these "happy little communities." What have we as a necessary consequence at p. 37?

"It is to be feared that among a great number of the inhabitants of the southern islands, we are now little more popular as a nation *than the Austrians were at Milan, or the Russians at Warsaw.*"

I have been, from time to time, accused of exaggerating the misgovernment of the Ionian Islands, and many of my English friends have observed to me, that such conduct in an English possession was impossible.

Yet here is one of the government, one of that very Bureaucracy itself, to whom this misgovernment is due, speaking of its practical working, in a pamphlet, intended to defend the past and present policy of British Bureaucratic administration in those Islands, in such terms as the above.

But on this very important part of my subject, I will go beyond the writer of this pamphlet, who avoids with all care, every reference to figures and statistics; for the benefit of the English reader, I will, therefore, describe, from the testimony of official documents, the true financial position, at which the Ionian Islands have at last arrived, after British management for 35 years.

Though the revenue of the State is now more than three times what it was in 1816, when Great Britain assumed the Protection of the Septinsular Republic,—the finances of the Ionian Islands have come to a *dead lock*, from positive inability to pay the salaries, the expenses, and the interest of the debt due to the Protecting Government !

The revenue for the last 35 years has been as follows :—

	<i>Annual Revenue.</i>	<i>Expenditure.</i>
1817		
1818		
1819		
1820	... £103,997*	... £87,420*
1821		
1822		
1823		
1824		

At this period Sir T. Maitland died, leaving a surplus of £156,250 in the Ionian Treasury, and was succeeded by Sir F. Adam.

1825		
1826		
1827		
1828	... £140,000*	... £156,250*
1829		
1830		
1831		
1832		

* As given by Sir Charles James Napier, in his work entitled "The

Sir F. Adam retired, having consumed the surplus left by Sir T. Maitland, as well as an excess of revenue, by increasing the expenses £68,000 per annum beyond those of Sir T. Maitland, who had been considered extravagant.

	<i>Annual Revenue.</i>					<i>Expenditure.</i>
1833	£158,980
1834	£156,517

Lord Nugent retired, having not only brought back the expenditure to the income, but also made such retrenchments as to leave a surplus for his successor, amounting to £126,550.*

1836	}	£259,567*	£275,491*
1837	
1838	}	£203,240*	£250,195†
1839	
1840	£159,293
1841	£145,518
1842	£149,520

Here Sir Howard Douglas retired, having expended all the surplus left by Lord Nugent, and incurred for the Ionian States a National Debt of more than £150,450, which, as Mr. Stewart Mackenzie, his successor, said, in his first speech to the Legislative Assembly, would “necessitate the sale of the national property to liquidate it.”

1843	£135,031‡	£127,403
1844	£143,198
1845	£184,890			
1846	£168,129			
1847	£156,118			
1848	£180,393			
1849	£162,000			

Colonies, and the Ionian Islands in particular.” London: T. and W. Boone. 1833.

* As given by Count Viaro Capo d'Istrias, in his “Remarks, &c., on a Despatch, dated 10th April, 1840, from Sir Howard Douglas, Bart., to Lord John Russell.” London: 1841.

† It is from this point the National Debt dates. The revenue also began to fall at this period, while the expenses were kept up to the same point.

‡ Lord Seaton's Report, in 1846.

Here Lord Seaton retired, having, during his administration from 1844 to 1849, made continual efforts to reduce the expenditure. He was enabled, as we learn from his reports in 1846-8-9, to reduce the expenses in 1844-5-6 by £8,615 ; in 1847 by £26,209 ; but in 1848, from particular causes, the expenditure increased by £14,482.

	<i>Annual Revenue.</i>	<i>Expenditure.</i>
1850 £147,482* £170,000†

Figures like these speak volumes—but the Ionians had not, until within the last three years, an opportunity of reading them—and they are now for the first time submitted to the judgment of the British Public in a collected form. I trust they will not be without their due effect in this country. In the Ionian Islands, the editor of one of our ablest newspapers, the *Patris*, thus remarks upon them:—

“ In the thirty years which have elapsed from the 1st of January, 1818, to the 1st of January, 1848, the Ionians, a population of not more than 220,000 souls, have had to pay taxes to the enormous amount of FIVE MILLIONS ! Of this five millions, the first fifteen years did not absorb more than £2,392,000 ; that is to say, the expenditure did not exceed on the average £158,000 per annum. In the second period, that is to say, from 1833 to 1848, the expenses absorbed £2,608,000, or at the rate of £174,000 per annum, on the average. This is more than the revenue could produce. Thus in *these last fifteen years the receipts were constantly less than the expenses*, and the natural consequence was that we contracted a debt. This public debt (which has now, 26th May, 1849, reached the sum of £245,000) amounted in January, 1848, to £216,000. By adding to this debt the surplus that existed in 1833, we have a sum total of £309,435 expended in fifteen years beyond the amount of the annual revenue.”

Such has been the financial management of the Ionian Islands since the British Protection. Let us endeavour

* Vote of the Ionian Assembly—Corfu, Nov. 25 (Dec. 7), 1850.

† Of this amount one-fifth (now reduced to £25,000) was paid to the Protection, and £15,000 (now reduced to £13,000) to the Lord High Commissioner (who receives £5,000 of it for himself) and his Civil List.

to obtain a glance at what was the case before that happy but expensive event occurred.

In the year 1815,* the revenue of the Islands was £68,459, and their expenditure £48,500, leaving a *surplus* of nearly £20,000.

In 1817, the first revenue year of the Protection, the finances rose to £103,997, and the expenses to £87,420, and this, as I learn from a Return published in 1820, was in addition to £145,203 spent by the Protecting Government in that year, and £120,045 in the next.

Twenty years afterwards, in 1838, the revenue wrung from the Ionians by Sir Howard Douglas was £203,240, and the expenditure rose up to £250,595! leaving a *deficiency* of nearly £47,000; almost as much as the whole expenditure of the unprotected States was in 1815!

In the year 1815, that is, previous to the British Protection, the number of Public Employés in the Ionian service, receiving salaries above 100 dollars, was, as I learn from a return published in 1820, four hundred and ninety-seven, at a cost of £22,687; while in 1819, that number had risen to five hundred and seventy, at an expense of £49,890; the number of persons employed having increased by *one-seventh*, and the amount of salaries received by them being DOUBLED! (See Appendix B.)

In a Return of British subjects serving in the Ionian Islands, published in 1821, I find the following List of annual salaries, under the head of Military Establishment:—

Colonel Honourable P. Stuart, Inspector of Militia	...	£383	5	0
Colonel Robert Travers	383	5	0
Lieutenant-Colonel Napier	383	5	0
Lieutenant-Colonel H. C. E. V. Graham	383	5	0
Captain Kramm	191	12	6
Captain Knox, Sub-Inspector	191	12	6
Captain H. Heathcote	228	2	6

* Williams's Travels. Appendix A and B.

Brevet Major O. V. Temple	228	2	6
Brevet Major M. Prager	191	12	6
Captain Richard Carroll...	191	12	6

A note appended to this Return says, "The whole of the foregoing salaries are *paid from Ionian funds*, in dollars at 4s. 6d. each;" while we learn from another column, that all these officers were "on full pay," but "draw no British pay;" "receiving forage and fuel," not from the British Commissariat, "but at the expense of the Ionian Government."

Can the reader believe that, with all these officers, and all these salaries paid to them, there never was, and NEVER HAS YET EXISTED, ANY IONIAN MILITIA FOR THEM TO COMMAND! Not a word on this point, however, appears in the Return.

It is noticeable, that while Sir T. Maitland's expenditure modestly jumped from the £48,500 of 1815, to the £87,420 of 1817, that of Sir F. Adam, because he had a surplus in his treasury, went boldly up to £156,250 in 1825. The crowning leap of all was, that in Sir Howard Douglas's time, when, as there was, also, once more, a surplus (thanks to Lord Nugent), the expenditure sprang at once, vigorously, to £275,491 in 1837; being nearly *six times* the amount which we, the Ionian people, paid for our Government previous to the infliction upon us of "the blessings" of a Protecting Government!

Since that triumphant period of Anglo-Ionian expenditure, the descent has been sure though gradual, through various gradations of debt, until the diminishing population, the decaying commerce, and the decreasing exchequer of the Islands, have forced the sad truth upon the Protecting Government, that the beast is overburdened, and that the Ionians can pay no more taxes. The only question now remaining is, who shall be the sufferer from the retrenchment that must inevitably

come,—the English, or the Ionians; the Government officials and pensioners, or the hard-working industrious public servants? In short, shall the salaries of the useless or the useful be retrenched? Shall the retrenchment effected be full and ample, or shall it be such as merely to make the expenditure square with the receipts? Shall there be such a modification of the method of taxation as to relieve the heavily-burdened people; or will you do no more than screw out of us every farthing you can under the old system, and carefully expend every farthing you can screw out? Such was the question to which the Legislative Assembly of the Ionian Islands considered themselves called upon to direct their attention, on the opening of their adjourned session.

Nor, with all this prodigality of expenditure, this vast machinery, for so small a Government, has the condition of the people been improved, or its commerce been aggrandized. What we exported then we export now, and nothing more; all interchange of commodities being prevented by a heavy duty on every article whatsoever imported into the islands, and a tonnage tax on every vessel that leaves it, to say nothing of export and import duties on all articles conveyed from one island to another; so that the very seas between us, that should provide us with cheap roads, are barred by heavy turnpike tolls in every harbour, to prevent that interchange of commodities, which, if so necessary, as the new light of political science tells us, between nation and nation, is to a certainty, doubly, and more peremptorily, requisite between towns, cities, and districts of the same community.

It follows, therefore, that I am compelled to declare the painful truth, that the so-called Protection of Great Britain to the Ionian Islands has, by the gross mal-administration of the successive Lord Commissioners

(with but two exceptions, Lord Nugent and Lord Seaton), been virtually no more than the possession of the fortress of Corfu, and a healthy barrack for 4,000 English troops; and that this Protection has been detrimental rather than advantageous, not merely to the happiness, but also to the moral and commercial progress of the Ionian Nation. Greece, and even Turkey, have advanced, while we, most certainly, up to the last four years, have retrograded. Our people are poorer, our commerce has decayed, under the withering shadow of the British Oak. We have found harbours for your fleets, money for your soldiers, salaries for your young cadets; while our own marine has rotted, unemployed, and our own youth, having vainly sought employment in their own land, have never yet, in one single instance, found reciprocal occupation in yours.

What the Ionian Islands are, the returns of our debt and our deficient income, the Reports of the number of our people flogged, shot, and hung by Sir H. Ward, will testify. What they might have been, and what value they might yet be, even to Great Britain herself, was admirably pointed out twenty years ago by one of the most eminent men of the age, Sir Charles F. Napier, who, himself filling the office of Resident in Cephalonia, and observing the mischievous policy pursued towards those Islands, wrote of them as follows, in a book which was published in 1833 :*—

“ Like the Bermudas, the Ionian Islands possess a central position, being surrounded by countries undergoing great political changes, in which changes England, right or wrong, will interfere; with which countries she drives a considerable traffic, and among which she oftentimes has waged, and may again wage war. We see that the Ionian Islands are midway between England and the Persian Gulf; are two—

* “THE COLONIES.” Treating of their value, and of the Ionian Islands in particular, by Colonel Charles James Napier. London : T. and V. Boone, 1833.

thirds of the way to the Red Sea; they are conveniently situated to communicate with all parts of the Levant; they block up the mouth of the Adriatic Sea; Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Tripoli, Tunis, Malta, Venice, Sicily, Naples, Leghorn, Genoa, Ancona, Venice, Trieste, form a belt of great towns around them, at no very unequal distances. A steam-boat could go from the Ionian Islands to any one of these great commercial cities in about sixty or eighty hours: in short a steamer from the Islands can reach large cities in Asia, in Europe, or in Africa, within a few hours' time. They are central to these three continents, and they bear strongly upon the lines of the Mediterranean commerce." (P. 9.)

After referring (with the eagle gaze of a prophet into the future) to the prospect of a passage over the Isthmus of Suez being opened, and pointing out the probability, now fast approaching, of the trade of the East returning on its ancient tracks, the gallant General goes on to say:—

"Will it not be wise, if our commerce by the Cape is likely to suffer, to prepare for its diminution, by cultivating our Levant trade in time? * * * In short, we ought to strengthen and multiply our channels of commerce in the Levant, but which commerce has rivals far from contemptible; and without entering further into detail, it may be affirmed that our preponderance at Constantinople, Smyrna, and Alexandria, is essential to our trade in the Levant. Under these circumstances, referring to the geographical position of these Islands, I ask if a vigorous British colonial government, fairly established in the Ionian Islands, with harbours, ships, sailors, troops, immediate and well enforced demand for reparation in cases of wrong offered to British commerce, and so forth,—I ask if such an establishment would not powerfully strengthen our commerce? * * * A strong government in the Ionian Islands will give vigour and protection to our mercantile exertions. I say 'a strong government,' because, unless the Islands are vigorously governed, so as to draw forth their resources, they will continue to be mischievous to England, and will sink into ruin and misery, as they have been gradually doing under the expensive and debilitating government of the last six or seven years." (Pp. 12, 13.)

[This was published in 1833. What have been the Governments of the last eighteen years?]

"I have stated my reasons for thinking that the Indian overland trade will, at no very distant period, revive with increased activity.

I have assumed that, in such a case, it becomes important to England, that she should have a stronghold to protect her commerce in the Levant; and finally, that the possession of the Ionian Islands may answer this purpose admirably, both in war and in peace. They can also furnish a considerable body of seamen and small craft for the landing and re-embarkation of troops; and in time of war could raise a disposable body of *six thousand good soldiers*, besides *thirty thousand militia*, to defend their country against any attack. A Greek is a soldier by nature: his sight is so keen that it surprises our most expert sportsmen; his body is well made and active; he is capable of bearing great fatigue, and requires little sustenance."

*** "If our Protection was well administered, we should find the Islands afford a good market for our manufactures,—my reason for saying so is that the islanders (particularly the Cephalonians), drive a considerable retail trade: for example, a vessel is freighted thus: the owner, the master, the sailors, and all their friends, contribute in money or goods, and when the vessel is loaded with a variety of articles, away she sails, a floating shop, directing her course to all places where the master and crew think a demand may be found for any portion of their cargo. If this vessel is *large*, she goes to Constantinople, the Black Sea, to Smyrna, Alexandria, to the coast of Italy, &c.; and if *small*, she runs up a thousand little creeks, and traffics with the villages on the Greek and Dalmatian coasts: in this way an extensive traffic is carried on. When the vessel returns, the profits are divided, and the temporary partnership dissolved."

*** "To conclude then, by a summary of what has been said. In *peace*, we have a safe commercial dépôt, immediate protection to our merchant, and a general security to trade. In *war*, we possess a defensive force of 30,000 militia, a large body of soldiers, and a number of small vessels, ready at all times to assist us in any expedition: magazines and safe harbours; a strong influence at all times on the councils of the Greek Sovereign and nation: and the power of raising, on an emergency, a disposable auxiliary force of six or ten thousand soldiers, who, if not equal to British troops, would be much less expensive than they, and equal to any in the surrounding countries. We should also give safety to our commerce, and assume a commanding position in the Levant."

"Do I then strain my argument too far in saying that these Islands, *if well governed*, would give us great and preponderating strength in the Levant? *strength without cost*, for on this I pivot the whole force of my argument. If it is granted that I have fairly stated the case, the conclusion must be that the Ionian Islands are of *vast political importance to Great Britain*. If so, let me ask, should they be given

ap, because Sir Frederick Adam had not the talents to economise their revenues, and to draw forth their resources? Assuredly not: it is not the Islands which have been an expense to England, but Sir Frederick Adam that has been an expense to England." (Pp. 15, 16, 17.)

Nor was the moral better than the monetary administration of the Protection. The Ionians have not yet acquired the use of their own language in their law courts. It was but last year that it was introduced, *as an innovation*, in their Colleges; where for the first time the studious youth of a Greek race heard themselves addressed by a Lecturer in the Greek language. For thirty years we have struggled for a press, not one public printing-press being allowed during that series of years in the Seven Islands. This, at last obtained, has, by the diplomatic shrewdness of Sir H. Ward, which he mistakes for cunning, been almost as effectually silenced, as if he had succeeded in carrying his proposed measure of last year for enchaining it, by the adroit manœuvre of publishing papers on the side of the Government, which are supplied gratuitously; and so, in the present infant moments of the press, effectually suffocate by their cheapness the circulation of those independent papers, which require a subscription for their support.

Such is the perpetual trickery of the Ionian administration, such is the constant *mala fides* of the Government, that no honest man, no friend of his country, can be associated with it without losing honour and self-respect. It has been so from the beginning—Sir T. Maitland being obliged to bring forward a Constitution by the Treaty of Paris, took care to make it a toy, a trick, a phantasmagoria; and such it has continued, through Sir Frederick Adam and Sir Howard Douglas, down to Sir H. Ward, who has shown himself the most adept juggler of the whole series, in pulling the strings of his puppets

into attitudes of violent constitutional liberty, and managing his shadows so as to reduce them into the purest despotism.

Impressed with a conviction that this deception is no longer tolerable, I have for some time past endeavoured to bring the condition of the Ionian Islands under the notice of the British House of Commons, confident that it required but exposure to insure redress. But it has not been so: I have been met on all sides with most extraordinary ignorance; I have even been asked where the Ionian Islands were! And what England could have to do with the people of Persia! And finally, when, last year, Mr. Hume, whose generous advocacy of the Ionian cause is now almost patriarchal, brought on his motion for a Committee of Inquiry into the cruelties committed on the Cephalonians under Sir H. Ward, so satisfied were honourable Members with the off-hand declaration of the Ministry, that Sir H. Ward was a Liberal and a statesman, and therefore *must* have acted rightly, that seventy-one voted against the motion to thirteen for it!

Defeated, but not dispirited, I recognised the necessity of the circumstances, and have, since that period, sedulously applied myself to the enlightenment of public opinion on the subject. That I have done good service, not only to my own countrymen, but to the people of England, I have reason to believe, as well from the flattering reception which the Letters of AN IONIAN have met with from the public, as from the kind communications which have from time to time reached me on the subject, from distinguished individuals of all parties. I can afford, therefore, to despise the utterly false, malignant, and libellous attack on myself and my motives, proceeding from the dominant bureaucratic and blood-thirsty despotism in the Ionian Islands, of which the Rector of the Ionian University has not thought it

unworthy his literary position to make himself the organ in this pamphlet. I shall, however, reserve myself to answer, in its due course, the malicious libels he has directed against my friends, through me.

The Ionian press is accused of "monstrous and shameful injustice," for "its studied concealment," in not recapitulating the "blessings," which, according to this writer, the Ionians have received from British Protection. "They invariably represent," he complains, "the Lord High Commissioner as a cruel despot;" a fact not to be wondered at, considering that the only Lord High Commissioner they have known since a newspaper has been allowed has been Sir H. Ward, upon whose blood-stained brow, what the writer calls "their brutal and groundless calumnies" justly fall thick and threefold. We are told also to admire the fact that the Ionian Government surpasses that of the Neapolitan and Roman States, much more Turkey and Greece. In both the latter cases I deny the correctness of the author's statement. In Turkey and in Greece there is more justice and liberty than in the Ionian Islands; and an Englishman, I must add, must be indeed hard-run for a defence when he takes to a comparison between the despotism of Sir H. Ward and the unmitigated tyranny of the King of Naples, or the clerical chicanery of the Papal government.

I will not follow the writer in his strictures upon Greece, its Government, and its Constitution; but unless it be among those Greeks, who, as he tells us at p. 67, are in the habit of learning what an Englishman's sentiments are, before they answer his questions, I am at a loss to imagine where, throughout the whole Levant, he could have met with a Greek to acknowledge "that it would have been better for their country—on first shaking off the Turkish yoke—to have been content with something short of complete independence; and

rather to have passed for a time under the tutelage of one of the great European Powers, in the same sense as England became, in 1815, the Guardian of the Ionian Islands" (p. 33). The Greek who said this to the University Rector, must indeed have been a phenomenon of servility, a lickspittle of the vilest breed; surely a creation of that learned Bœotian brain, which looks on all men as little boys who require "gradual training," and as always to be led up by the slowest of all possible processes "to the full enjoyment of the *dangerous privilege of self-government*." To hear this pedant prate to us about liberty, one would think that the Greeks had not known it before the first Celt had risen from the mist and mud of his early birth—had never fought for and won it with their blood, even within the last quarter of a century.

Unable to differ,—however willing to do so,—with the opinion of the Ionian character so forcibly expressed in the eloquent language of Sir C. Napier (which, by the bye, he quotes, not from that gallant General's work, but from a letter by myself in the *Daily News*), the writer endeavours to depreciate the Ionian character by accusing us of degenerating from our ancestors, owing to our four hundred years' "subjection," as he calls it, to the corrupt rule of Venice, though it should rather be styled our "incorporation" with the Venetian States. This poor argument is that of Sir Howard Douglas, in his Despatch of April 10, 1840. But he has forgotten that it is now fifty-three years since the Islands ceased to be a Venetian State: and is nothing to be expected from an education of thirty-five years (more than one whole generation), under British administration? The argument of Count Viaro Capo d'Istria (p. 21) is convincing upon this point. It was written in 1840, and is therefore stronger by eleven years.

"I have under my eye," says Count Viaro, "the list of a Meeting of the Electors of this Island (Corfu), of last year, and I find inscribed

on it 222 families; and of active individual citizens 584; among the families only 33 of the old nobility, and among the individuals little more than 100. Now if the body of the Electors is so changed, can a different judgment be formed of the population, of which four-fifths, at least, knew not the Venetians, and of which, three-fifths were born and grew up under British Protection?"

The same Count Viaro Capo d'Istrias, writing in the Islands, speaking of notorious facts, supplies me (at p. 13) with an adequate answer to one of this author's bold assertions at this point; that, "during more than thirty years, not a single instance of peculation has been even suspected by a most suspicious people" (p. 36); an answer which I should have had some delicacy in myself giving, while writing at this distance on so special a subject. He says:—

"In the finances of Zante, under the British dominion, before the Constitution of 1817, and in the treasury of the Customs of Corfu, and of Paxo, and in the Monte di Pieta of Zante, after that epoch, there were persons guilty of peculation: among these were British subjects."

It is the fashion of this writer to speak of the Ionians as incompetent to manage their own matters, and unfit to be trusted with their own money; but the very next charge against them proves their competency; for it shows that they have cut down their expenses to the scale of their finances, and made the salaries such as they are willing to do their own work for, themselves. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Hence this pamphlet! We dare say, in the so-much-lamented retrenchment of the collector's stipend, the Rector, trembling for his own, saw the

" ——— Proximus ardet,
Ucalegon!"

"The salaries of all the collectorships," he tells us with a piteous howl, "have been cut down, for the express purpose of rendering them untenable by English-

men!" Such was not the intention; the true reason being, that there was no money to pay them without going deeper into debt; the Assembly resolved to put a stop to that course at once: they retrenched—in every instance that they were permitted by the terrified officials, who clung pathetically round the knees of Sir H. Ward, as if a hungry lion had broken in amongst them,—their own allowances, those of the Senators (oh! the agonizing squeal of the Rector on this point), and even those of their Bishops. But, as the Rector has raised this unlucky question, let me ask, as my countrymen are always doing, Why are all those offices filled up by Englishmen? Why must we have genteel youths perpetually imported to lounge on our esplanade, and be plentifully paid for putting their names to papers, and pocketing their salaries? At first, we were told, that "it was absolutely necessary to have a few experienced Englishmen at the head of the administration of justice, of the finances, and of the police;" and forthwith a crowd of Osbornes, of Hankeys, and of others, whose names, to avoid personalities, I will not mention, flew over to us, and there they have stuck ever since, every possible place that an Englishman can be squeezed into being filled by an Englishman; but the worst of all is, that where a dollar richly pays an Ionian, a pound is but a poor common for your English well-fed ox to browse upon; and so, the Ionians having lost the emoluments for their own use, have been compelled to double and triple them, to make them suitable to such men as this Bowen, who are good enough to come and fill the first offices in their despite, besides libelling and calumniating them.

The Rector tells us that within the last two years "a feeling of aversion towards England and Englishmen has sprung up among a portion of the people." I deny this *in toto*, and regard it as an assertion merely made to

introduce what follows about "the fierce agitation carried on by demagogues, and the full license of calumny and misrepresentation granted to the press." It is an old trick of the Ionian Bureaucracy to stigmatize as enemies to the Protection all who oppose the method of its administration. It was so with Sir H. Douglas, who bespattered his adversaries right and left as seditious traitors; and with Sir Henry Ward, who banished the newspaper editors, when they did not agree with him, and put the High Police into action to knock up the best citizens of Corfu at night, and seize their papers and persons. But the administration is not the Protection. Sir H. Ward is not, I gratefully thank Heaven, the Sovereign of Great Britain. There may be a change of men; we may hope for a change of measures. Tiberius shall not always enjoy his Capri undisturbed. The Alcinous of Sheffield may yet follow Lord Torrington.

Yet that it is not Englishmen who are disliked, but the administration of the English Lord High Commissioners, is well known, for the author declares that his countrymen are treated with respect and affection in private life, and even he confesses, at p. 38 of his libellous work, that—

"The very best understanding has generally existed between the lower orders and the private soldiers. Regiments which—like the Rifles, the 42nd Highlanders, and some others—had peculiarly endeared themselves to all classes by their good conduct and courtesy, embarked, when ordered to another station, from under triumphal arches raised by the spontaneous affection of the Ionians, and amid universal tears and regret."

Such were the principles and practice, and such the effects of a Government which, after a careful experience and investigation of three years, Lord Seaton determined to remedy, no less out of justice to the Ionians than with a due regard to the honour of England. The hostility to any change, which dared not show itself, while his lordship presided over these officials as their chief in the Islands,

thwarted and obstructed his progress at the time, as far as lay in its power, by private representations to the Colonial Office, and finally led Lord Grey to supply Sir H. Ward with the instructions which he took with him to the Islands, to neutralize the measures and render nugatory the reforms of his predecessor;—that hostility, which wiped out the disgrace of its temporary defeat in the blood of the Cephalonians, now blazes out in the pages of this pamphlet, in a fierce onslaught on Lord Seaton's administration. His Lordship is attacked for endeavouring to make the Ionian Constitution a reality and not a mockery—for conceding the freedom of the press,—and for permitting the Assembly to regulate that portion of the public expenses, which have no reference to the Protection. As regards the Ballot, it may as well at once be set down that the attack in that respect on Lord Seaton is gratuitous and unwarrantable. The Ballot was demanded by a large majority of the Assembly—an Assembly chosen under the old forms; it was, moreover, originally a part of the protection to the peasant voters under the old Constitution, and was therefore no innovation, as the writer would have his English readers infer, but a restoration.

Previous to going further into those points—as we shall shortly have to deal with the opinion of the Rector of the Ionian University upon the qualifications of Lord Seaton for governing the Ionian Islands—we may as well clear the ground by quoting the Duke of Wellington's recorded sentiments of the capacity and conduct of that noble lord, as shown in the emergencies of the Canadian rebellion.

“I had the honour,” said his grace, in the House of Lords, on the 27th of March, 1840, “of being connected with the noble and gallant lord in service at an early period of his life, and I must declare that at all times, and under all circumstances, he gave that promise of prudence, zeal, devotion, and ability which he has so nobly fulfilled in his services

to his sovereign and his country, during the recent proceedings in Canada. I entirely agree with the noble Viscount in all that he has said respecting the conduct of my noble and gallant friend, in remaining, under all circumstances, at his post, and in taking the command of the troops, although it was not thought expedient by the Government to place him again in the government of the provinces. I agree with the noble Viscount in wishing that such examples as that which has been shown may be always followed in her Majesty's service ; for I must say that there never was a brighter example of fortitude and discretion than that which has been manifested by the noble and gallant Lord."

To be praised by the Duke of Wellington for "discretion" is indeed *laudari a laudato*. Lord Seaton may, therefore, afford to put up with the abuse of the Rector of the Ionian University, who, conceding to him the attributes of "courtesy and hospitality," "laborious attention to public business," and "ready accessibility to every class," goes on to impute to him in the early part of his administration the fault of imagining that he "could see everything with his own eyes," to accuse him of "injudicious and well-meant meddling," and to say that "to the heads of the several departments of the public service he left little real power."

Now, this is exactly what my countrymen imagine to have been one of Lord Seaton's greatest merits. This was exactly that quality of mind, that capacity for investigation, which made him our greatest benefactor. He would not do as other Lord Commissioners had done—surrender himself on his arrival into the hands of the officials, and allow them to weave an intricate net of misrepresentation about him. He would not see with their spectacles ; he would not be put into harness and managed by secretaries and "heads of departments." He examined and inquired, calculated and compared, sought and acquired information ; and oh ! horror of horrors for the Bureaucracy, actually allowed a notion to enter his mind that an Ionian might be able to give him some useful information on Ionian affairs ! And

thus he went on acquiring knowledge, and making himself personally acquainted with the habits and wants of the people.

Thoroughly ignorant of the subject he is discussing, or wilfully blind to the information, certainly, at the command of one who had "access to official documents," the advocate of the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy, who, with his perverse ignorance, or wilful concealment, and misrepresentation of facts, is a worthy champion of the cause he supports, sets down all the subsequent reforms effected by Lord Seaton in the Ionian Constitution as the result of events happening at the time they were promulgated, and confines his opposition to the measures of his lordship,—simply, to certain acts of practical administration from 1843 to 1848, which he styles "serious and often ludicrous defects" (p. 40), and "unfortunate trifles" (p. 41), consisting of a "Penitentiary and a model farm," and "the ship canal of Santa Maura." "The great expense of these works," says this writer, with the unblushing effrontery of one who sticks at nothing in a bad cause, when he does not suspect that he can be answered, "increased too by mismanagement in their details, has very materially embarrassed the Ionian finances" (p. 41).

I will not have the impertinence to pretend to defend the administration of Lord Seaton—it requires no defence,—the enduring gratitude of my countrymen is the best testimony of its great merits; but I may be pardoned if, having shown the misrepresentation as part of the tactics invariably pursued by the Anglo-Ionian Bureaucracy against all who oppose them, I now proceed to refute it.

The debt of 1842-43 (which Lord Seaton found on his arrival, as mentioned above (p. 42), in the letter of Lord Charles Fitzroy), the falling off of duties from successive unproductive crops of olives, and the outlay

in public works, it cannot be denied, caused a deficit annually, even after the stipulated military payments had been modified. The works undertaken were for the desired advancement of the States, and most of them were warranted by the wants of the Islands, and of a neglected rural population. These may be comprised in the buildings required for the Monthly Circuit Courts introduced; the instruction of the children of the peasantry in agricultural affairs; the classification of criminals, and their withdrawal from the disgraceful places of confinement allotted to them; the opening of a passage and improvement of the harbour of Santa Maura; and the repairs of the halls of the University and colleges.

Now, I contend that every one of these practical measures came within the duty of a Government, and that the exigencies of the people and the time required that they should be at once undertaken.

I will now examine these measures in detail. The writer says, at p. 40, that "unpopular regulations almost emptied the public schools of their pupils." I am assured, on the contrary, that education at no time was so flourishing in the Islands; that the people had confidence in the schoolmasters, and in the direction and bias that would be given by them to their children's minds; inasmuch as all the injudicious regulations, by which English sectarian teachers had been placed in chief command of the primary schools, had been removed. At the higher schools and the University, the number of scholars recorded as being in attendance while Sir Howard Douglas was in office, was nearly doubled. In every pamphlet and publication having reference to this period, in every subsequent allusion to it by the press, I find not only no dispraise of Lord Seaton's administration on this point, but also the highest encomium; and I can only impute the observations of this Rector of the University to the desire expressed by Lord Seaton, that

the education of the people should be as much as possible carried on by qualified instructors, speaking their own language, and of their own faith.

The official report on Education in the Ionian Islands in 1845-7 is as follows:—

EDUCATION.

“ The establishments for education at the seat of Government are:—

- “ 1. The University, the number of students in which, including seminarists, amounts to 75.
- “ 2. Ecclesiastical seminary for the education of young men dedicated to the priesthood, who also attend the University.
- “ 3. Minor College; at present attended by 94 scholars.
- “ 4. Model Schools; at which, in addition to the course of instruction common to the primary schools, agriculture is taught, both in theory and in practice.

“ In every island there are, first, a secondary school, where the elementary branches of classical and mathematical learning are taught. In the larger islands, each student pays 12 dollars, or 2*l.* 12*s.* per annum. In Santa Maura and the three smaller islands, 6 dollars, or 1*l.* 6*s.* per annum. Secondly, a central school upon the mutual instruction principle, where the poorer classes are instructed gratis in reading, writing, and arithmetic. In the central schools the village school-masters are trained.

“ Lastly.—Primary schools in all the considerable villages upon the same principle as the central school, the buildings and one-half of the salary being supplied by Government; the remainder of the expenses defrayed by the parents of the children attending.”

Of the necessity of some practical exertions on the part of Lord Seaton to carry into execution a portion, at least, of the many promised plans for the amelioration of the condition of the people, the following passage from M. Mustoxidi's *Promemoria* of 1839 will afford sufficient testimony, and will show, moreover, the method in which, in every possible manner, the administration of the Ionian Islands was made a delusion by the Bureaucracy, after the fashion of the houses and palaces run up by scene-painters on the road-sides to the Crimea whenever the Empress Catharine travelled

through her newly-acquired and, as she thought, immediately civilised territories :—

“ Agricultural Societies, Industrial Societies, ‘ Sociétés anonymes,’ ” (partnership associations like your English Companies, but divested of individual responsibility), “ National Banks, draining of marshes, all excellent ; but where are they to be found ? Only upon paper. The Code appoints houses of correction, discipline, and penitentiaries ; but no such houses are to be found, and the prisons that receive the unhappy without distinction of age, sex, or offence, become the schools for greater crimes. Orders for the establishment of Asylums have been decreed, and, nevertheless, the streets are blocked up, and churches and houses are besieged by crowds of mendicants, who drag on their miserable existence around these places ” (par. 112).

Now, Lord Seaton actually did all that Sir Howard Douglas promised to do. But, says the writer, “ the details were mismanaged.” I scarcely think they could have been otherwise, when I know to whom Lord Seaton was compelled to intrust the carrying them out ; when I know that, being intended for the good of the Ionians, the working of those excellent plans fell into the hands of “ the heads of departments,” against whose wishes they were put into operation, and whose every wish and effort was directed to thwart them.

“ On the Model Farm, and its appurtenances, there were laid out in all £7,870, and the only return is £210 from the stock and implements brought out from England at a great expense, but sold by auction, last summer, when the Parliament decided on breaking up the establishment ” (p. 41).

The insidious object of this statement is apparent ; but its importance diminishes, and its malice becomes evident, upon a close examination by any one who understands the subject.

The Model Farm at Castellanus was established in 1844, and the establishment was broken up in 1850, a period of *six years*, which, with rent of farm, purchase of implements, all of which are, *of course* (as from the best

shop), brought from England (where else would the learned Oxonian have had the purchases of agricultural implements made?), expenses of establishment, &c., hardly exceeds £1,250 per annum; no very large sum for an agricultural college or Model Farm, as some, who farm for their own pleasure, or are subscribers to the agricultural college at Chichester, inform me. That the agricultural implements brought only £210 at a forced sale does not surprise me. Men seldom give much for articles of which they do not understand the use, or which they have been taught to undervalue. Nor do I suppose that, if the books or the brains of the learned Rector were put up to sudden auction, the Cephalonian portion of my countrymen would be inclined to bid very highly for such bargains, however valuable. That the Model Farm was required, our author acknowledges. A better authority on this point, however, is General Sir C. J. Napier, who devoted a greater part of his attention to this object, and whose book is filled with details of his attempts* in this direction, and the record of the manner in which all his efforts were thwarted by the Bureaucracy, and the officials about the Lord High Commissioner of his time. That the £7,870 was a beneficial outlay, is proved by Lord Seaton's official reports in 1847-8-9, wherein he, inadvertently, alludes to them as follows:—

1847.—“The cultivation of wheat and corn is extended, and a desire to define boundaries, which a few years back were unknown, is indicated by the operations of fencing, ditching, and draining, hitherto entirely neglected, which are now carried on to an extent that promises further advantages and prosperity.”

1848.—“Those improvements in agriculture which have been mentioned in former returns, are becoming every year more extensive and general, especially in the Island of Corfu.”

* “The Colonies and the Ionian Islands,” by Lieut.-Colonel C. J. Napier.

1849.—“Where agricultural operations, such as ditching, fencing, and draining, have now extended, increased salubrity has been the result: these operations have been extended,” &c.

Of the necessity of the Penitentiary I need not speak—the objection of this author that it cost £48,000, and has been placed where it interferes with the fire of the fortress, is utterly idle and absurd. It will be time enough to talk of that when there comes an apprehension of an attack; in the mean time, the convenience, vicinity, and cheapness of the purchase of the locality, provide ample interest for an assurance fund against such a contingency.

It would not have been amiss had the writer,—when seeking to point out what even he considers mere petty blots on what he acknowledges to be an administration practically faultless,—called our attention to the admirable exertions of Lord Seaton to accomplish the object of making justice sure, speedy, and certain to the Ionians, and shown how he brought it home to every man's door. What was once thought upon this subject may be learnt by a reference to that remarkable storehouse of Ionian grievances, the *Promemoria* of M. Mustoxidi (par. 54):—

“Not even a Justice of Peace has been granted to these country districts, so that the peasants, for the least offence, are dragged from the most distant parts of the country to the town, before the tribunal of justice, to become the laughing-stock of lawyers, and at the expense of loss of time, of injury to their agriculture, the corruption of their manners, and exorbitant costs.”

Lord Seaton obviated this inconvenience and annoyance by the appointment of Circuit Districts, “the beneficial effects” of which, he reports in 1847, to be “everywhere acknowledged and fully appreciated,” and in 1848 pronounces the advantages arising from them as “continuing to increase.”

The separation of the municipal revenues from the

General Fund was another instance of that careful study of the wishes and the genius of the people committed to his charge, as developing themselves in their ancient and national institutions. He found everywhere the remains of the old Roman constitution—those particular regulations of municipalities, which tend, above all, to educate a people in self-reliance and independence, and which, above all,—even in the most troublous times of public confusion, even in the very storm of revolution, or during the raging of the fiercest tempest of war,—preserve the order of a community, the safety of individuals, and the security of private property. These institutions it became Lord Seaton's primary object to restore; and it was the restoration of these that led him up, by a gradual process of reasoning, and a chain, as it were, of authoritative circumstances, to realize the amendment, or rather the restoration of the Ionian Constitution. In this Lord Seaton differed *ab initio* with the Bureaucracy of Anglo-Ionian officials. His method of "educating the Ionians in the enjoyment of liberty" (an education which all the despatches of the several Colonial Secretaries, and of almost all the Lord High Commissioners, declare to have been in progress during the last thirty-five years without having produced any result), was to accustom them to self-reliance and self-government—that of the Bureaucracy was to centralize every act of power, to make all things result in, and emanate from, the offices of Corfu. Such, also, had been the leading idea of the administrations of Sir Thomas Maitland, Sir Frederick Adam, and Sir Howard Douglas.

My countrymen, who knew the tendency of such measures, had, from the first, remonstrated in vain. Little by little, each right had been filched from them. In 1839, M. Mustoxidi repeated their complaint in par. 54 of his *Promemoria* :—

"The Ionian departments are not yet organized by a proper council, and though they contain a great number of proprietors, some of whom are rich, and belong to the body of electors, yet they do not enjoy the privilege which the communities of Greece used to possess even in the days of Turkish tyranny, that of electing their own magistrates and managing their own affairs, but are under officers imposed upon them by the police, which thus rules and directs with an absolute influence the inhabitants of the country districts, and at the time of the elections exercises a pernicious preponderance."

Again, at par. 60 :—

"And, at last, even the slight latitude which had been allowed to the municipal bodies of each island—of administering their own revenues, has been snatched from them ; and in order to render them more dependent, these revenues have been thrown into the public treasury, and the estates from which they are derived menaced with an immediate sale."

Lord Seaton restored the municipal management of the local revenues, and remodelled the local governments on their ancient basis. The writer bitterly complains of the choosing of the Municipal Councils of the several islands by free election, and talks of the "evil of an elective magistracy,"—an evil which I have always understood to be considered a particular advantage of the British Constitution. Nor is he more happy in his objugation of Lord Seaton for the appointment of District Councils, seeing that, so far from "maintaining a club of subtle and sagacious, but idle and inexperienced peasants," he was promoting order and increasing responsibility by making the people responsible successively to each other, and so securing the Government itself from every possible pressure of a general opposition.

The writer of this pamphlet, who had "access to official documents," knew very well what was the object of these District Councils. He knew that Lord Seaton intended to procure through them a means of making the people themselves the vigilant superintendents of

their educational establishments. The writer knew, —from his office, he must have been well acquainted with —this object ; for what purpose, then, does he strive to conceal and misrepresent a fact, which was publicly declared in Lord Seaton's last address to the Assembly, April 3, 1849, as follows :—

“If a revision of the municipal system should take place, District Municipalities might be advantageously instituted, under whose immediate management and inspection all district schools could be brought, as well as the details relative to local roads and internal communication, and other matters connected with the returns of the *Synclitæ*, and the sessions of the Monthly Circuit Courts.”

“The real wants of the country would be soon ascertained and understood, through the exertions of active privileged District Municipal Bodies ; and as the field for improving your institutions has now become wide, it would be thus opened efficaciously to an industrious rural population.”

Are these the words of a “busy-body?”—the emanations of a “wild speculator?” Are they not rather the well-considered results of a careful investigation, by an honest and practical mind, into the requirements of a people committed to its charge ? Happy, indeed, would have been my countrymen, if the words and intentions of their rulers had always agreed, as in the instance of Lord Seaton !

Whatever the writer of this slanderous pamphlet may choose to say of these District Councils, their effect has since been what the Assembly at the time declared it would be, “to prevent the inconvenience of an excessive system of centralization, and efficiently provide for local wants.”

These measures, with the amendment and bringing into full operation of the *Procedura* (regulations for law proceedings), and of the Codes, together with the equitable adjustment of the stipulated annual military payment, by which a reduction from £35,000 annually

to £25,000 was effected, constitute the great practical benefits conferred on my countrymen by Lord Seaton. I must not omit, however, the appointment of a Preventive Police, by which crime in the Islands was diminished *more than one half*, and a conviction of the certainty of apprehension and punishment brought about in men's minds, that took away from intending offenders all possible calculation of the chances of escape. Of the further advantage of these police measures, the report to the Secretary for the Colonies speaks as follows :—

“The growing confidence in the Protection afforded by the improved system of police. Five years ago, scarcely a week passed without a report by the police of rural property damaged to gratify envy or revenge, a crime now seldom heard of.”—*Colonial Blue Book*, 1846, vol. 37, 1847, and in several other passages of successive years.

As regards the financial management of Lord Seaton, which this writer, who, throughout, does not condescend to the statement of a single figure, or the authentication of any one fact on which he bases his reasoning, affirms to have “materially embarrassed the Ionian finances,” it can be estimated by the following official statement in his lordship's last address to the Assembly, on April 3, 1849,—an address which, as it were, closed and balanced his lordship's financial and moral accounts with my countrymen. The pamphlet-writing pedant cannot deny these figures, nor dispute the deduction from them; their simple truth demolishes at once whole pages of his calumnious insinuations, and they form the very best defence which any friend of Lord Seaton's could condescend to put forth as a reply.

“You will perceive,” says his Lordship to the Assembly, “from the accounts of the past year, that the expenditure has not exceeded the revenue, and that the gross balance in the Treasury on the 31st of

January last amounted to £15,437, credited to the general account, and £14,830 to the municipal revenue, and that these balances have been appropriated to the services of the current year.

“The amount of the actual debt on the 31st of January, 1847, exclusive, however, of contracts, for which the Executive Government were responsible, was stated at £137,428; since that period, a diminution of the debt to the amount of £6,947 has taken place, a repayment of £9,430 has been made to the Ionian Bank, and nearly all the expenses connected with contracts have been liquidated.”

Of the debt thus mentioned, £84,465 consisted of arrears due to the British Government, out of a debt of £131,250, which had accrued from 1839 to 1843 (under the administration of Sir Howard Douglas!) on the annual payment of £35,000 made by the Ionians to Great Britain, to pay the expenses of the British troops held in garrison at Corfu for British purposes exclusively. Such was the condition in which Lord Seaton found the finances, that, while there was no money in the Treasury to carry on the public works or pay the officials, neither was there any credit or any means available for meeting a sudden emergency, though Sir Howard Douglas had given a Charter to an Ionian Bank, an establishment of which, as I was myself unfortunately the suggestor, in 1834, I may be permitted to say that it has since degenerated into a body of usurers at £10 per cent., and money-mongers at even higher rates, to the great oppression of the poorer class of landholders, whose property it is gradually absorbing into its coffers.*

* The following remarks, which I made in a letter to the *Morning Chronicle* of February 11, 1841, on an article on the Ionian Finances in the *Malta Times* of the 15th November, 1840, will show, that these results were anticipated by me ten years ago: they will serve, moreover, to prove that the maladministration of my country, though long continued, has not been allowed to pass without continuous remonstrance:—

“The article in the *Malta Times* concludes with remarking, that probably Sir Howard Douglas will not consider it advisable to leave in the Treasury any dead moneys, from which no profit can be gained,

Will it be believed in the commercial circles of England, that, in a State under British Protection, and entirely

but that he will prefer to employ it in useful institutions, for the encouragement of agriculture, the improvement of public education, &c., especially, he continued, as, in consequence of the establishment of a Bank, should a moment of need occur, funds can be had to go on with; and, as a confirmation of the probability he has just alluded to, he states that the Government is not a shilling in debt. Happy would it be were it so. But, were there no other debt, there is that of the £77,860 due to the Protection, a debt to which a good administration would devote careful attention. Can it be good policy, by suffering the Pension Fund to be exhausted, to incur the risk of being obliged to apply to the Bank for a loan, wherewith to furnish the means of subsistence to the pensioners? Is it good to neglect all provision against disastrous casualties—to consume all, and then have to run and beg charity from the poor, to relieve the distresses of the unfortunate in Zante? that island having, even so late as 1838, possession of a surplus of £53,797. 3s. Why has not Sir Howard Douglas, at least, imitated his predecessors in this respect? When Santa Maura was, during the second Parliament, afflicted with a similar disaster, and the City was obliged to be rebuilt, General Adam was not under the necessity of resorting to loans; but, although that island had a deficit, he was able to afford it the sum of £26,079 from the surplus of State treasure; neither was there any need to have recourse to banks, for the Treasury was a bank to itself. Why did not Sir Howard avail himself of the wise counsel which Lord Nugent, in his speech on the 23rd of February, 1835, gave to the Senate, while congratulating himself on the prosperous state in which he left the resources of the Islands: ‘The balance, however,’ he said, ‘which this year appears in your accounts, would nowise justify any unnecessary expenditure, or the slightest remission of a strict and vigilant economy. There is probably no country, where nature, in general so largely bountiful to you, renders a great surplus in the accounts less safe to be trusted to as a promise for the future, or more needful to be watched with unremitting care. Remember that not only does the expenditure usually exceed the revenue in the alternate years, but extraordinary expenses often befall these States, against which no foresight can guarantee. May Heaven grant the removal of natural calamities, such as earthquakes and epidemics, by which climates like these, otherwise so favourable, may, besides the other misfortunes that such calamities produce, cause an enormous and sudden demand upon the treasury, to meet which a large disposable balance is indispensably requisite.’ Alas! what prophetic wisdom!

under the management of British officers for thirty-four years, we find one Lord High Commissioner, in the year 1849, speaking of "the difficulty of procuring loans authorized by the Acts of Parliament;" and another, in 1850, telling the Assembly that, in so special a case as the breaking out of the cholera in Cephalonia, the Government was, for the time, powerless in the face of a long-expected calamity, from the fact of there being no money in the Treasury! So that public subscription, and private and even Royal charity, were necessitated to be called in to the relief of the sufferers, until a loan of £6,000 could be raised at 5 per cent., as a great favour, under guarantee of the British Government, from the Ionian Bank! Impossible as this may seem, a reference to the last address of Sir H. Ward will establish the fact.

"I am fully aware," said Sir Henry Ward, on the the 1st of December, 1850, "that the financial position of the country requires this (an inquiry, to ascertain the practicability of effecting further savings without injury to the public service). No provision has yet been made for the debt. No margin remains for those extraordinary calls upon the revenue, which a calamity like that which has recently afflicted Cephalonia may at any time render inevitable. The Government, anxious to afford the promptest relief* to those who were

And how then is it possible to use the language of encomium, in reference to so mischievous an administration, as that, which, far from providing for such important contingencies, did not restrict itself to the consumption of all the revenues of the State, but even swallowed up the surplus balance existing in January, 1835, and leaves the State in a deficit of £77,000 to the Protection? What encouragement has been given to agriculture? What improvements have been effected in public instruction; if we except the College established within a few months, which was so urgently recommended by Lord Nugent? These are questions we should rejoice to see answered. But until that is done, and even then the case would not be much altered, notwithstanding the eulogies which the *Malta Times* bestows upon Sir Howard Douglas, the Ionians, it is to be feared, will be very long before they recover from the baleful effects of his administration."

* The condition in which the unfortunate population of Cephalonia

suffering under this visitation, as well as to place the other islands in a state of preparation, had the cholera extended its ravages, was compelled to have recourse to the Ionian Bank for a loan of £6,000, the application of which will be laid before you in detail by the Senate; and the Bank, with a liberality that does honour to it, voluntarily offered this loan at 5 per cent., *which is much below the usual rate of interest.*"

were placed at this period, can be judged of from the following statement, which I caused to be printed and circulated in this country:—

"The present condition of the population of Cephalonia (one of the Ionian Islands, forming the Septinsular United States, under the Protection of Great Britain), is most appalling. In the beginning of last August, the cholera, in its most virulent form, made its appearance in the island, and from that time up to the last advices, was carrying off the people at the rate of from 100 to 200 a week; the average mortality being nearly 50 in every 100 attacked. The nature of the country, which is divided in the centre by the high ridges of the Black Mountain (Mount Ænos), with valleys running down to the sea, which, also, almost cut the island into two divisions by a deep bay, renders it extremely difficult to furnish either prompt medical assistance or sustenance to the poor peasantry, who live in small lonely villages, precluded, by long distances, from mutual succour.

"The maritime population on the coast, deprived at one stroke of all employment by the strict quarantine which their terror-stricken neighbours at once imposed on Cephalonia,—preventing thereby all communication with the other islands, or the continent of Greece,—are caged up, as it were, in wretchedness, and are suffering every calamity which starvation can aggravate upon pestilence. Nor is this all—immediately previous to the cholera, a great storm burst upon the island, and an incessant rain for several days destroyed the crop of currants and olives, which form the staple produce of the island. The peasants, at the very time of harvest, falling dead from the cholera in their vineyards and by the road-side, had the misery, in their last moments, of knowing that those they left behind them were doomed, if not to death, certainly to famine.

"The labours of the field, the villages are now deserted, while the widows and orphans, the crying and the starving, throng in terror round the two towns of Lixuri and Argostoli, imploring food and help. All that the Local Government could do has been done in this extremity, and the inhabitants of the other islands have zealously united to the assistance of their afflicted brethren, with subscriptions, combining the charity of all parties from dollars to pence."

Such has been the Bureaucratic management of Ionian finances—such is the system we are called upon to admire—and to deplore, with this snivelling pedant, any attempted reform that may serve as an impediment to its continuance !

In spite of these difficulties, however, the Executive Government of Lord Seaton—

“Did not arrest the progress of improvements, but continued the construction of decreed roads, and of the buildings for charitable purposes, and others of acknowledged utility, and the repair and refitting of the lecture-room and halls of the University, College, and Seminary.”

After perusing this document, I find some difficulty in appreciating the judgment or truth of a writer, who can say (p. 41)—“It was no difficult matter to raise money, by suffering to run into arrear the annual payment of £25,000, due to the English Treasury as a contribution towards the cost of the garrison; and money lightly acquired, by what seems an invariable rule of our nature, is always lightly spent.” Considering that the debt due to the Protection was reduced by Lord Seaton’s management from £131,000 to £84,000, “against which account,” we learn, “claims for reduction are pending on account of the expenses of collecting revenues and undercharges under examination,” and considering that, by reducing the future payment to £25,000 per annum, the British Government tacitly acknowledged that the £35,000 which had created the arrear, was an excessive amount to subtract from national revenues so small, I cannot appreciate, as I have said, the truth or justice of this writer’s remark, the more especially as regards the money being “*lightly* spent,” when, according to Lord Seaton’s *résumé* of his financial administration,—

“The sanctioned extraordinary expenditure has been chiefly in-

curred in acquiring and completing buildings most necessary for the public service, and in constructing roads and other works, not only affording temporary employment to the peasantry in unproductive seasons, but developing the resources of the Islands, and creating a further demand for labour."

And, according to the writer,—

"A Penitentiary and a Model Farm were, no doubt, wanted in the Ionian Islands, and the Canal furnished employment to a number of labourers in a season of distress."

The *ship canal* of Santa Maura, by which, we are sneeringly told, "Lord Seaton determined to signalize his administration, and which this pedant, who can see no farther than his spectacles, declares to be "utterly out of proportion with the revenue of the State," has "already," according to his estimate, "cost £28,000, and will require £10,000 to complete it." As Sir Henry Ward, while speaking the opinion of the Bureaucracy in his last address to the Assembly, was compelled, nevertheless, to acknowledge that the Canal, when completed, would pay ample interest for the money, it will hardly be necessary for me to point out the incongruity of those who have, without remonstrance, seen hundreds of thousands of Ionian money squandered in useless alterations and additions to fortresses always hitherto virgin and impregnable even to their own forces, objecting to this outlay, of less than £40,000, for an undertaking, which will lay open a clear passage, under shelter, for the whole of the Levant trade with the Adriatic, saving a circuit of upwards of 50 miles; neither is there necessity for me to show the falsity of the supposition of those shadowy "Royal Engineer Officers," who informed the author that, "when the wind is contrary, ships cannot sail into it; and when the wind is fair, they will avoid the toll by sailing round the Island." I would advise the learned author to inquire

from these "Royal Engineer Officers," what constitutes what seamen term a "Soldier's wind," and then to make some arrangement with them for the definition of what, in honour of his eminent wisdom and nautical knowledge, may, in after years, be known as a "Rector's wind."

Of the long-known necessity of this Canal, we have sufficient proof in the following resolution of the Senate, dated Corfu, 25th June, 1819, for raising a tax in Santa Maura, signed "Theotoky," and "G. Osborne," and "approved by Sir F. Adam, Lord High Commissioner *pro tem.*" (Sir T. Maitland, as usual, being at Malta or on his travels), "and Frederick Hankey, Secretary of the L. H. C.," all of them the originators, advocates, and great supporters of that policy so much admired in this pamphlet.

"The Treasury of Santa Maura shall contribute the sum of 4,000 dollars annually, for the opening of the Canal that separates the Island from the Continent, commencing from the 1st of January, 1819, and ending at the completion of the work."

This was only to open the Canal for light vessels; while, by the plan of Lord Seaton, vessels of any burden can pass through between the Island and the mainland, and, were the writer's windy objection in any manner tenable, which it is not,—as every seaman acquainted with the navigation of the Gulf of Arta or Prevesa well knows, and I myself can bear testimony from my own experience,—a single steam-tug would obviate every contingency. To afford those not acquainted with the spot a correct notion of the advantage of this great work, I need only point out its similarity to those carried on by the East-Indian Government, in cutting a navigable channel through the ledges of rock extending from the Island of Ramisseram to the Coast of Madura, on the Continent of India, to widen and deepen the passage so as to obtain a sufficient depth of water for vessels of

moderate burden, and for the steamers from the Red Sea to Calcutta,—as well as to the great works, undertaken by the same Government at the instance of General Monteith, to open the Paumban channel, by which the circuit round the whole Island of Ceylon, “sometimes in the teeth of heavy and contrary winds, and always against currents more or less powerful,” was obviated to the craft engaged in carrying the produce of Malabar, Travancore, and other fertile provinces, to Madras.* The result in the increase of tonnage is shown by the following striking illustration. “Before the works were undertaken, the amount of tonnage that traversed this strait was from 20,000 to 23,000 tons a year; it has now increased to upwards of 100,000 tons in the same period, or five times the amount of what it was before.”

What is Sir Henry Ward’s real opinion on this point, when his own judgment was brought to bear upon the question, is shown by the following recommendation to the Assembly in 1850:—

“It is satisfactory to me to be able to state to the Assembly, that, so far as an unprofessional man can judge, the completion of this work will be less difficult than I at first anticipated. The compactness of the clay through which the Canal is cut renders it improbable that the sides will require to be strengthened by piles, or stone facings. The set in the current is sufficiently strong to keep the channel clear without dredging, and, even in its present imperfect state, 80 vessels are stated to have passed through it in the course of the present year, besides those which have loaded with salt at the salines. It is probable, therefore, that a considerable toll may be derived from this Canal, when completed to the depth and width originally proposed; and under these circumstances, I recommend the Assembly to take measures for bringing the work to a close as speedily as possible.”

That the Assembly did not vote the £10,000 at once,

* “Foreign Quarterly Review,” No. 72, July, 1845. Article on Surveys of the Indian Navy, pp. 484-5-6.

if it be as the writer says, must have been because they would not trust the present Senate with the disbursement of the money, or were unwilling, at a moment when every effort was about to be directed to enforce a rigorous retrenchment of the expenditure of the State within its means, to commence their economical career by creating a new debt.

The reader, perhaps, may here ask me, "If such was the excellence of Lord Seaton's administration, what becomes of your assertion of a general maladministration of the Ionian Islands, while under the Protection of Great Britain?" I reply, that Lord Seaton has been the exception, not the rule, and also that my countrymen justly complain of the system by which our rulers, and the ideas of Government, are perpetually shifting. What certainty, what fixedness can there be in the moral condition of a State whose "history is the biography of its individual governors," as this writer so impudently assures us? Sir Howard Douglas reverted to the policy of Sir F. Adam, which Lord Nugent had disturbed, and Sir F. Adam continued that of Sir T. Maitland. Mr. Stewart Mackenzie did nothing, gave no offence either way, but endeavoured to keep together and resolve into some order the *disjecta membra* of society, commerce, politics, finance, debt, and liabilities, which Sir H. Douglas left behind him. Lord Seaton recognises, restores, renovates, and reforms. Sir H. Ward follows to destroy, and returns back to the political system of Sir Howard Douglas! How Ireland flourished under Viceroy's, whose policy changed from persecution to liberality, and *vice versa*, with each change of an English ministry, is notorious. As similar causes produce like effects in the moral as well as the physical world, the perpetual shifting and changing of men and measures has not been without an effect equally injurious in the Ionian Islands. Had Lord Seaton been left to carry out the

reforms he had indicated, all would have been well. Equally regardless of the selfish intrigues of the Bureaucracy, and the clamorous nonsense of a seditious few, who, like starved seamen, gulped down at once too much of the food of liberty which had been so long denied them, and became swollen into demagogues, with a flatulency only dangerous to themselves,—Lord Seaton would have consolidated the liberties and the happiness of the Ionians; and a great reproach and disgrace would thereby have been averted from England.

The great fault of Lord Seaton, however, in regard to the party represented by this pamphlet, is not so much his policy, no, nor even his reforms, as the following bequest which he left to them. It is not that he governed the Ionians well, and would see to the government with his own eyes; but that, having given to the Ionians the main principles of reform, a free Press, freedom of elective franchise, and a control of the expenditure ordinary and extraordinary,—a subtle distinction hitherto carefully reserved by the Senate or the Executive,—he pointed out to them, also, what their Assembly ought to do when it was reformed. “I should recommend,” he said, “a Commission to be appointed to examine evidence relative to the practicable and desirable reductions which it may be expedient to accomplish in every department and establishment.”

This indication of retrenchment and economy fell like a bombshell on the Bureaucratic camp; for, from that moment, they saw that their emoluments were in danger, and that “extravagant and malignant proceedings,” as the author styles them at p. 111, would inevitably ensue, by which my countrymen would reduce their expenses within their income, and with them retrench the salaries of the *employés*, English as well as Ionian; that is to say, of such English gentlemen as held situations, which originally were intended to be

filled exclusively by Ionians, but into which the members of English Bureaucratic families have been foisted one after another. With them, too, it was foreseen, would suffer the shoal of time-servers, of flatterers, of selfish counsellors, who have hung about the skirts of the English officials, looking up with wistful eyes into their masters' faces, expecting, like hungry dogs, to pick up such offal and morsels as the satisfied and comfortable sinecurist might choose to spare them. The groans of this herd of sycophants may be heard in the following, at p. 111:—

“At any rate, the new system will produce much private misery. The position of the Ionians, who have made themselves obnoxious to the dominant” (that is, the economical) “party in the Assembly, by their long and faithful services under the British Protection, is peculiarly cruel. The posts occupied by some of them have been abolished, without any compensation for the incumbents; while the salaries of the rest have been reduced to a mere pittance, on which it is impossible to exist with comfort or even decency.”

The “comfort and the decency” in question being the enjoyment of salaries, on the scale of those in England, to be wrung from Ionian revenues, and expended at Ionian prices; the duties of such offices being almost two-thirds less than those of the least-worked Government clerk in the most quiet corner of your Treasury.

To return to the charges of this pamphlet against the administration of Lord Seaton. The writer, by a few sneers, having duly disposed, as he supposes, of the practical portion of his lordship's government, proceeds now to the political measures, by which the progress and close of that nobleman's Ionian government were so eminently illustrated.

The first three criminations are—will my readers think it possible?—that Lord Seaton “wrote *bad* Greek;” that he “had been graciously invited to dinner by the Greek *Casino* at Corfu, and had accepted the in-

vation!" thirdly, that he "announced his intention to remove all restrictions on the Press," of which announcement, the dinner, by the bye, was a consequence, thus aggravating the crime. Of the "*bad Greek*," I hardly know what to say, seeing that the gist of the charge lies in writing his invitations to Greek gentlemen in the Greek language; and, as it appears they were written in the modern Greek, possibly the "colloquial and corrupt style" may have shocked this egregious pedant, when he found that "recollections of Eton and Harrow could avail him but little" (p. 48). The use of the word *ὑπασπιστῆς*, for "aide-de-camp of the day," is correct, and, *pace* the Rector of the University, I should be inclined to think him wrong, as great men, *in general*, take care to have people about them, who do not make blunders in such matters. Indeed, I should not be surprised if some scholar, whose Greek, both old and new, was at least as pure as this pedantic objector's, had been called into counsel on this occasion. At any rate, the aides-de-camp of King Otho are called *ὑπασπισταί*, and I suppose, even if the Rector should be inclined to quarrel with the Greek of the Athenians, he will allow the Bavarian *literati* to be first-rate classical authorities. "All this is sad trifling," says the miserable scholar at this point, and I certainly agree with him; but, nevertheless, I think it will not be unamusing to hear how a learned donkey can bray, when he gets his favourite thistle under his tail.

"Towards the close of his administration, Lord Seaton caused the invitations to Government House to be couched, not as formerly, in English or Italian, which are the two languages of society in the island, but in modern Greek, a tongue very little more known to the gentlemen of Corfu, than Irish is known to the gentlemen of Ireland. Few can read, and still fewer can write it correctly" (surely Mr. Bowen means after the fashion of Eton and Harrow?). "But its employment is looked upon as a badge of *national*, THAT IS, OF ANTI-ENGLISH SENTIMENTS."

Could I be serious with a man who can write such

nonsense, and call it argument, I would, most emphatically, protest against the national feeling of my countrymen being set down as *Anti-English*. Nothing can exceed this falsehood, as I shall hereafter show, unless it be the subsequent statement, that the gentlemen of Corfu can neither speak nor write Greek. The Rector of the University must have kept strange society to have discovered this singular secret; or have remained in a remarkable seclusion, even from his unfortunate pupils, ready, open-mouthed, to swallow any fables that might be brought to him.

Having disposed of the *bad* Greek, I will proceed to the dinner, which, *au contraire*, the Rector, sniffing from afar, pronounces to have been "excellent" (p. 45); but of which he, nevertheless, makes a handle, for the purpose of charging Lord Seaton with deception and double dealing. As this will serve as a specimen of the trick and subterfuge that distinguish every argument of the Bureaucracy against those who venture to oppose them,—their falsification of evidence, and wilful perversion of facts,—I will extract it; since, though unimportant in itself, it gives the key to the whole course of the offensive and abominable policy of the Anglo-Ionian official clique.

"In his despatch of March 29th, 1848, Lord Seaton thus writes to the Colonial Secretary:—'Several public dinners have been announced, with a view of drawing forth public opinion; but there are so many influential persons, who disapprove of such proceedings at this time that I hope the present excitement will subside without embarrassing the general or local government!' He forgets to inform Lord Grey that he had *himself engaged to dine on the 4th of April, that is only six days after the date of this despatch, at one of these very public dinners, whose announcement he seems to regret.*"

The italics are the writer's own, and the inference wished for is obvious; but the passages marked as omitted in the extract from Lord Seaton's despatch by this *candid* writer, are as follow:—"Although persuaded

that the liberty of the Press, and some other privileges, cannot be withheld from this community;”—while the preceding words are, “I understand that there are several petitions in circulation for signature, soliciting changes in the Ionian Constitution, and several public dinners,” &c. So that it was these petitions, as accumulating excitement on a point already considered as settled by the well-informed, that Lord Seaton deprecated. Yet our learned Rector, who wishes to be thought not a partisan, and who takes pains, at p. 78, to assure us that he is not exhibiting a partiality towards Lord Seaton, has, most insidiously, and knowingly, and carefully, mangled this passage, to serve the purpose of his party in calumniating a Lord High Commissioner, who had dared to act contrary to their advice. It was on this occasion, and in this despatch, that Lord Seaton, having previously, on reiterated occasions, strongly urged these points on the attention of the Colonial Office, requested the immediate sanction of her Majesty’s Government—

“1st. To establish a free Press.

“2nd. To place the extraordinary expenditure under the control of the Legislative Assembly.

“3rd. To alter the mode of municipal elections, by establishing the right of the electors to elect their municipal officers freely, and without the interference of the Lord High Commissioner or Executive Government.”*

I shall not trouble myself with what the writer says of M. Napoleon Zambelli, whom Lord Seaton justly characterized in his despatches as “one of the most eminent and respected advocates of the Bar of Corfu,” and as “anxious not to embarrass the general Government,” but whom the present writer denounces (I have no doubt M. Zambelli will be proud to be so accused) as “an open and undisguised enemy of the *system* pursued by the Protecting Government;” neither will I take notice of the silly

* Papers respecting Recent Changes in the Constitution of the Ionian Islands, p. 2, No. 2: Lord Seaton to Lord Grey. March 29, 1848.

and ignorant statement of the Casino being "a Radical Club," which it is no more than is the Athenæum Club in London; but I will pass on to the writer's complaint against Lord Seaton for removing the restrictions on the Press.

To judge from this writer's statement at p. 49, we would suppose that this, and all other of Lord Seaton's Reforms, were got up in the ten days subsequent to his having "received notice that his term of office had expired;" while the fact is, that the removal of the restrictions of the Press, and the additional Legislative control over the expenditure also, were proposed in 1844. These proposals, so far from being the result of the French Revolution, were renewed before that had broken out in 1848, as is proved by the dates of the despatches. In fact, I may say, that the necessity for such changes was mainly impressed upon the mind of Lord Seaton rather by the Athenian changes in 1843, which, as entailing a free Constitution in Greece, could not but influence the policy and progress of the Ionian States.

On this point I happen myself to be able to bear testimony; for being strongly impressed with the necessity of a Press, to the development of Ionian national feeling, and, as the one great means for bringing the opinion of the people to bear in obtaining justice from the Protecting Government, and a due control of its representatives, I had in the year 1844 intended, as Great Britain would not allow a newspaper to be printed for the Ionians in the Ionian Islands, to bring one out in England for them, and transmit it over; nay, more, I had made up my mind to try the question, at my own expense, whether a Lord High Commissioner, could order an English newspaper to be excluded, as those of Greece had been done by Sir Howard Douglas. Previous to going to this length, however, I wrote to Lord Seaton apprising him of my

intention; and his lordship, with that urbanity which has always distinguished him, honoured me with the following reply.

“*Corfu, 22nd August, 1844.*”

“ Sir,

“ I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th of July, with its enclosure, the prospectus of the *Ionian*, and to acquaint you, that it will afford me great satisfaction to encourage any gazette or newspaper that may contribute to promote the welfare and happiness of these States. I have no doubt that the measures which are in contemplation, for removing gradually some of the restrictions on the Press of the United Ionian States, will prove highly satisfactory to their community.

“ I am, Sir,

“ Your obedient Servant,

“ *George Dracato Papanicolas, Esq.,
Erechtheum Club, London.*”

“ SEATON.” *

To hear this pamphleteer prate of the removal of restrictions on the Press, one would think that newspapers had always been plentiful in the Islands, but had been carefully muzzled, as dangerous, and had been suddenly let loose, like raging tigers over the land, by Lord Seaton. Now, the fact is, that there were no newspapers at all! Not even a printing-press, except one, *kept under lock and key*, at the Government House! And this in a country administered by Englishmen! Lord Stanley, in 1843, as did Lord Glenelg in 1836, and Lord John Russell in 1839, considered that a free Press in the Ionian Islands would be inconvenient, as tending to embarrass England with the “Continental Powers!” But such excuse for such a fact, though Lord John Russell had partially recognised it in 1839, could not endure in 1848, or with a straightforward Statesman like Lord Seaton, who set “inconvenience” on one

* For the Letter which invited this reply, see Appendix C. His Lordship’s assurance that the restrictions on the Ionian press would be removed, of course rendered the publication of my intended newspaper unnecessary.

side, when he found it opposed to justice, and chose rather to peril a little "embarrassment" from too much liberty, than the decadence and dry rot of the State from a continued despotism. We are told, by this pedagogue, that, as the result,—

"Newspapers sprang up on every side, full of the most bitter abuse of England and of Englishmen, repudiating British Protection, and openly avowing annexation to Greece."

Here the worthy schoolmaster is guilty of a small, though important, anachronism. Nothing of this kind took place until *after* the atrocious cruelties committed under the orders of Sir H. Ward in Cephalonia, when every mind revolted against the outrage committed on the honour of the Greek race, and when, in Cephalonia itself, the whole population united in a resolution never to cease from agitation and opposition until Sir H. Ward was recalled. The Cephalonian Press took this tone; and no one, boasting the Greek blood in his veins, can impute this to them as a fault; for never did Sicily under Verres, or Ceylon in later times, witness more illegalities, more wilful misrepresentations, more studied concealment and perversion of the truth, more sanguinary cruelties, than has Cephalonia under Sir H. Ward. The unrequited blood and sorrows of her children will for ever remain a stain and disgrace on the escutcheon of Great Britain.

It serves the purpose of this writer, when speaking of the Press, to refer to the Radical and very extreme portion of it only, as a specimen of the Ionian newspapers. This is just as fair as if I were to send the *Northern Star* or *Mr. Reynolds's Newspaper* to Corfu, as representatives of the English Newspaper Press, and of English public opinion. He well knows the incorrectness of this course; for he compliments M. Napoleon Zambelli, the editor of the *Patris*, which is, or was, the leading Journal of the Seven Islands, and for temper, judgment, elegance, logical argument, knowledge, scholarship, and acumen, might fear no comparison with the

very ablest of its contemporaries in France and England; I say *was*, because I have reason to fear that Sir H. Ward has made use of his journalizing experience in England, to smother an opponent, whom he could not otherwise silence, by distributing amongst all classes, gratuitously in large numbers, regularly, other papers paid to praise his government and slander his opponents; thus rendering the subscription to an independent journal, apparently, a superfluous expense. This "trick of trade," that brings the capital of a Government into the calculation of competition with that of an individual, is so novel a specimen of administrative diplomacy, that I have little doubt it will shortly meet with the public attention that it deserves.* The Ionian Press, however, once called into existence, will, despite every exertion of the few remaining relics of despotic authority, still exist and flourish. As in the forest the decay of one giant is the cradle of another, so where the *Patris* bowed its head, the *Hellas* now flourishes in fresh and youthful vigour.

The writer likes a Tory authority;—indeed, these are at times more liberal than the Whigs, as in the eminent instance of Lord Seaton, and, therefore, as regards the liberty of the Press, I will show him what was the opinion of the Earl of Liverpool (no very liberal authority), when addressing the House of Lords in 1816 (Hansard, vol. 32, p. 650). "The Government of France was, indeed, a systematically organized despotism. What, for instance, was its conduct with regard to the liberty of the Press? That liberty in this country was subject to no restraints but those which were necessary to the safety of the Government: and even with respect

* It may serve to show the candour of the writer's assertion about the Greek language, given above (p. 90), when we state that, with two exceptions, that of the *Patris*, which is printed in French and Greek, and the *Φίλος τῆς λαῆς*, Sir H. Ward's paper, in Italian and Greek, all the other Ionian newspapers are printed *entirely* in the *Greek* language, which the writer tells us no respectable person can understand!

to that safety, how many instances might be found where writers were tolerated, while, to use a familiar phrase, we 'sailed very near the wind' indeed. Yet such was the high and just estimate of the liberty of the press in Great Britain, that abuses of that liberty were often overlooked, lest its importance and utility should be impaired. But what was the system of France under Buonaparte? Why, a censorship was established," &c.

Now, was it intended by the statesman who thus spoke, that the Ionian Press should be chained by England? Certainly not. Nevertheless, it was so during thirty years, and we are now called upon by A MAN OF LETTERS, the HEAD OF OUR UNIVERSITY, forsooth, to regret that we *have power even to print books!*

Of the exercise by Lord Seaton of certain arbitrary powers vested in him by the Constitution, subsequent to these acts of liberality, I shall not enter into a discussion; his position at the moment was exceptional. The writer, however, must have known, when he asks why Lord Seaton did not make a trial of his newly introduced system of Juries against the offending Newspaper editors, that the arrangements for summoning the Juries and the Lists for that purpose were not perfected at the time. He tells us, after a sneer at trial by jury in general, that "Juries are either a fit or an unfit institution for the Ionian people. If fit, they should be introduced into *all* criminal processes; if unfit, they should *not* be introduced into the trial of offences of the press." I cannot allow him to impale us upon this dilemma. Politicians are not always strictly logical, neither are similar circumstances always identical. Trial by jury could nowise be better introduced than in questions relating to the press; nor is it, in any case, more necessary than when the opinion of a nation seeks expression against the method of its administration.

The abolition of the Primary Council—that practical

falsehood, by which the retiring Assembly, chosen previously by the Lord High Commissioner, elected themselves as their own successors, and re-appointed their coadjutors to make up the requisite number of Legislators—will not be considered in this country as one of Lord Seaton's faults; neither will, I think, his having given "up to future Legislative Assemblies the final and decisive control of the whole Public Revenue," be so estimated. But that "this has enabled the Assembly utterly to cripple the entire machine of Government," I utterly deny, as well as that "they have not failed to exercise that power." Not one office held by an Englishman, (except such as it was agreed by the Convention should be filled by Ionians), has been touched by the Assembly, who, indeed, by a special regulation, have been prevented from doing so. On the contrary, £25,000 is ordained to be paid to the Protection before even the salaries of the judges are paid,* while a fixed amount (£13,000) is settled to be paid to this Lord High Commissioner's Civil List, in perpetuity. The machine of Government is not "crippled;" although the Ionians have retrenched Ionian salaries to Ionian means and Ionian requirements; and although the Senate, the Assembly, and the subordinate officers, are working now

* See Papers respecting Changes in the Ionian Constitution. Despatch of Lord Grey to Lord Seaton, March 20, 1849, p. 120.

"It will be an indispensable part of the proposed arrangement, that a law should be passed making this Contribution a first charge upon the revenue of the States, to be discharged in regular judicial payments, and enacting that no money shall at any time be paid out of the Ionian treasury, for any other purpose whatever, until the amount due to the military chest for the preceding period has been liquidated."

I beseech my readers to remember that this peremptory £25,000 is expended solely for British troops, kept in the Ionian Islands avowedly for *British purposes*, and that it is in addition to £13,000 paid annually for the Civil List, as I have said, of the Lord High Commissioner, for the salaries of himself and other British *employés*. The Ionians thus pay almost one-fourth of their revenue to Great Britain!

for something less than half of what they received in 1848, the work is, nevertheless, executed with equal facility and despatch.

The pamphleteer says, that the Ionian Assembly, who voted these reforms, were as "unwilling to sign the death-warrant of their own existence," by enacting Vote by Ballot and Household Suffrage, as English country gentlemen would be, but that they had not the moral courage to resist the Press and the people! If we may judge from the despatches, the Assembly was a very willing victim, for we find its members, from 1847 to 1849, repeatedly urging, at every possible opportunity, further alterations in the Constitution, of a still more liberal tendency; neither can I trace any signs of their "complaining bitterly," according to our author, "of liberty being forced upon the Ionian Islands, where liberty was almost a thing of yesterday." How liberty can be but "a thing of yesterday" to the Ionians, it is difficult to understand, when, according to the writer's own representation, the parties of democracy and aristocracy were engaged in a fierce struggle in 1800,—half a century ago! How long is "yesterday" to be? when will the morrow of liberty dawn upon the watcher?

The fact is, if the truth must be told plainly, the then Assembly saw the time had come when the public purse would no longer bear so many hands dipping into it; it felt that the Ionian peasant,—who pays all the taxes, be it known, for there are none on property, only on produce and articles of popular consumption,—it felt, I say, that the peasant could endure no more taxation; the very capital of labour, over taxed, was beginning to diminish in productiveness. The Assembly, conscious of this, determined to yield to the necessity of change. Change, they knew, would produce inquiry, and inquiry retrenchment; retrenchment would cut down their own allowances, and so render their

re-election not desirable for themselves—the leeches were full-gorged—thus it was that they willingly assented to the vote by Ballot, though with a full conviction that it would exclude themselves from the Assembly.

The supposed responsibility, which we are here told the Assembly desired to impose upon the Lord High Commissioner, was an accident of words. The object of the alteration in the constitutional law, was to render the Senators responsible to the Assembly for their Ordinances, which, according to that Constitution, had the power of Acts of Parliament, during the recess or prorogation of the Assembly. It was by this plan, so cunningly devised by Sir T. Maitland, that the Lord High Commissioner was enabled, by proroguing the Assembly, to insure the enactment *pro tempore* of any measure he might choose to propose. But the author takes the opportunity to ask how an English functionary, “supported by as large a fleet as won the battle of the Nile, and by 3,000 of the best soldiers in one of the strongest fortresses in the world, can be held responsible to an Assembly of Greeks, sitting under the guns of that fortress, and utterly without the physical power to put one of their votes in execution without the aid and countenance of that very English functionary?” Such is the insulting language continually held towards my countrymen by this writer, who draws his salary from them. Such the good taste and discretion with which the power of Great Britain is asserted in the Ionian Islands. Let me, however, inform this pedant, that it is neither in her fleet, nor in her soldiers, nor in *our* fortresses, wherein lies the strength of Great Britain;—but in her moral influence. When that fails, her powers will decay, and she must fall, as Carthage and as Rome have fallen before,—her equals in commerce, and more than her equals in power. A few years of Sir Henry Wards, Sir Howard Douglasses,

and Sir Thomas Maitlands, require a century of Seatons and of Nugents, to make sweet the memory of English rule.

But the writer's observation respecting the indifference of the Ionian Assembly, as formerly constituted, to the liberty of their country, is of more importance than the reader would be at first inclined to judge. This is the assertion that has ever been dinned into the ears of the Downing Street officials by the officials of Corfu,—“the advantages of delay,” the “indifference of the opulent classes to any change,” the “danger of concession,” have been the perpetual theme of all “private letters” of the Bureaucracy,—the “advantages of delay,” combining to them a longer enjoyment of large salaries, with the prospect of a change turning up; the “indifference of the better classes,” meaning that the time-servers and place-holders of the Assembly, as elected by the Government, would rather that things remained as they were; and the “danger of concession,” that, as what was once granted could not be taken back again, it would be better to grant nothing at all. From time to time the Ionians have heard or read of a Colonial Minister's observation, that—

“It would not be for the honour of this country to have occupied the Ionian States for so many years, without having advanced the inhabitants towards some qualification for institutions more liberal than those which were granted to them avowedly as a mere preparation for such a change.”*

And then, just *eleven* years after, we hear that, when something had at last been done, Lord Grey, earwigged by the Bureaucracy, writes in fear and trembling to Lord Seaton:—

“Changes of this kind require to be introduced with the more

* Despatch of Lord J. Russell to Sir H. Douglas, 21st Dec. 1839. Papers on the Ionian States, 1840, p. 5.

caution, because when once made, they practically cannot be withdrawn. I should, therefore, be disposed to proceed *somewhat more gradually* (!) than I understand you to recommend If the most intelligent and best educated of the Ionians are decidedly anxious for a more rapid advancement in the course already commenced of giving greater political power to the people, it may be expedient to comply with a desire thus generally entertained There is no unwillingness on the part of Her Majesty's Government to improve the institutions of the Ionian States, and to give them a more popular form, and the only question is as to the greater or less rapidity with which this should be done." *

The most intelligent and the most educated Ionians were so "decidedly anxious" on this point, (despite all that the Rector says,) and Lord Grey was made so conscious of it,† that the Reform of the Constitution followed. Lord Seaton, who had now been in the Islands five years, gave strong assurances of the safety and probable good effect of the measure. But, says our Rector, "the science of Government is an experimental science, and like all other experimental sciences, should progress slowly." The universal experience of mankind having assented to the propriety of a man's putting on his breeches first (when he has any to put on), I shall not venture to differ with so learned a logician on this point; nevertheless, it does not follow that because the nether garments are put on in the morning, a man should therefore wait until night before donning his coat. Yet, what would this be, other than the conceding a free press to a people, the giving a control over expenditure to their Legislative Assembly, and then denying them freedom of election? Could the Primary Council exist with the vote by Ballot, or of what use would be the latter if the

* Papers respecting Changes in Ionian Constitution. Despatch of Lord Grey to Lord Seaton, October 26, 1848, p. 119.

† See letter of Dr. Zambelli to Earl Grey on Ionian Reform, written in the Ionian Islands previous to the French revolution, but not published in London until after it.—Cox, Brothers, 1848.

Senate of the Lord High Commissioner marked out the persons to be elected? Lord Seaton desired to be just, and therefore could not avoid being consistent. The instant common sense was applied to Sir T. Maitland's Constitution, down came the whole fabric, tumbling in ruins to the ground; or, like the fabled money of a cheating enchanter, showed itself, in the daylight of truth, but as withered leaves.

What need to go further into this point, or into the other attacks on Lord Seaton's Government, which this candid writer repeats over and over again, by such repetition seeking to make the faults of that admirable administration appear to have been numerous? I may but show how by a playfulness of style he has yet the confidence, in closing this portion of his *brochure*, to tell us that he has been on his "guard against the influence of *Lues Boswelliana*, as Mr. Macaulay has named that disease of admiration, to which most biographers are liable. Much as we admire Lord Seaton," &c.

And then he goes on to say that there is but one opinion of Lord Seaton's administration; and that is his own! and that with him accord—

"The Senators, Judges, Secretaries, and all other public servants in the Ionian Islands, whether Greek or English, the vast majority of natives occupying a rank in life analogous to that class out of which the members of our own Parliament are chosen" (he means that portion of the landed proprietors who are under the thumb (I should say in the *thumbscrew*) of the Ionian Bank), "the officers of the present garrison, and of the ships of war on our station, the members of the British Mission at Athens (!), and the British Consuls throughout the Levant (!)" (p. 78).

This was exactly the very snug party of English officials, to whose representations Lord Seaton preferred his own observations and that of the Ionians themselves, as to what was good for the Ionians. What are "the officers of the ships of war" to know of the people?

What "the members of the British Mission at Athens," and "the British Consuls throughout the Levant," except to make use of them, as Sir Edmond Lyons did in the late Greek affair, to inflict a quarrel upon Greece, under the pretence that it was in defence of the Ionians? As for the "Senators, Secretaries, and public servants, Ionian or English" (I leave out the Judges, who have no right to appear in a question of political matters,)* their opinion avails but little on this part of the question, especially in regard to a late Lord High Commissioner, whose successor differs from him in policy. Suffice it to say, that every improvement, from first to last, that has been effected in the Ionian Islands—everything that made anything except a job there—has been done against the wish of the officials. These men, then (we have only the Rector's word for it), dislike Lord Seaton :—

"But with the mass of the people the remembrance of Lord Seaton is popular, in the same sense as the remembrance of Lord Normanby is popular in Ireland."

I have no doubt Lord Seaton will be content with this dispraise—let the writer explain it away, and qualify it, hereafter, as he may.

How Sir Henry Ward left this country—with what disposition towards the Ionians,—will be seen from a correspondence that will subsequently appear in its proper place. He arrived in the Ionian Islands on the 1st June, 1849, and it was soon discovered that, whether from his own disposition, or acting upon instructions from the Colonial Office, he came prepared to undo all the liberal measures of his predecessor, or at any rate, to neutralize their effect. A silent

* I learn, by the bye, that Sir H. Ward is removing and exchanging judges and magistrates to more inconvenient and less lucrative localities, because they have given decisions contrary to his political views. See *Patris*, No. 104.

antagonism at once arose between the enlightened portion of the Ionians and the new Lord High Commissioner. They watched him, and were prepared—but he had them at a nonplus. The Constitution had been altered, but the alterations were not finally accepted, and he pounced down upon all objections against his wishes with the Maitlandish argument of “You *must* do this, or have nothing.” Therefore, all his propositions were voted and acceded to at once. I will not enter into these details, for I have from time to time presented them in full before the public as they occurred. Suffice it that, having taken away all but Vote by Ballot and Freedom of the Press,—at which he made a snatch,*—the Assembly handed him over a Civil List *à discrétion*, with one dissentient vote, together with a total readjustment of the system of election, by a majority of thirty-two to four; and then the Assembly were dissolved; and then came the result of freedom of election—*almost the whole of the new Assembly returned, by a free election, were, to a man, in opposition to his Government.*

But there were more than mere ordinary political circumstances to operate to this remarkable result—a result unparalleled in the history of nations. There was the sanguinary, cruel, lawless revenge which Sir Henry Ward had taken upon the Cephalonians. The shootings, the hangings, and the floggings, which have stained with disgrace and blood the flag of England,—have exhibited an English Government to the world as a spectacle of monstrous abuse of power, surpassing the newspaper-recorded cruelties of Haynau. And yet of these, though the Rector of the Ionian University does not come forward as the defender, he has the audacity to appear—he to whom our Ionian youth are intrusted—he who

* See his message to the President of the Senate. Corfu, May 21, 1850.

pretends to be enthusiastic in love of Greece and admiration of her ancient virtues—he—stands forth as the defender of the wretch, who has degraded the Greek name by the infliction of an infamous punishment on Greeks!

A partial outbreak in Cephalonia was regularly put down by Lord Seaton, who shot and hung no man, like a coward, in cold blood. Acting on his advice, and in promotion of the policy pursued by all his predecessors, of dealing gently with a people "impressionable," as he says, "and easily excited," Sir H. Ward had granted an amnesty, and had gone to the extent of receiving some of those who had been banished and condemned to death to dinner at the Government House.* The amnesty was at the instigation of Lord Seaton.

Worse than all the crimes of Lord Seaton, in the eyes of the old Tory clique, is that, though himself a Tory, he could not be brought to shed the blood of the people committed to his charge, by way of protecting what, according to official ideas, the Bureaucracy call "their property" (in their salaries), and their position (in snug office), by terror and death.

Let us hear this advocate of the foul system, that has too long oppressed the unhappy Ionians, speak the blood-thirsty doctrine of his crew.

"The insurrection of September 26, 1848, was pronounced an act of treason by the Supreme Court at Corfu, and a few persons implicated in it were awaiting their trial on the arrival of the new Lord High Commissioner. On that occasion it was thought proper to grant them an amnesty. Now, among orientals, all concessions to political opponents are set down to fear or imbecility; in the East, prisoners have almost invariably been put to death as a matter of course. A copious shedding of 'vile black blood,' as in the Roman proscriptions, is the ancient panacea for all social evils. In the late War of Independence, the Greeks usually slaughtered their Turkish prisoners, without being conscious of the commission of any act of great irregularity; on the same principle, in fact, as that which had actuated

* See Despatches relating to the late Disturbances in Cephalonia.

the wholesale execution of the partisans of the defeated factions at Corcyra, and of the Platæan and Melian captives during the Peloponnesian war. Those, who measure such deeds by an European standard, prove that they have a clearer conception of the laws of humanity and justice than of oriental reasoning and usages" (pp. 86-7).

This abominable hounding on to the shedding of "vile black blood" drove Sir H. Ward, (who fell under the influence of this Bureaucracy immediately on his arrival, and who acted under their advice), to the hateful cruelties exercised by him in Cephalaria—cruelties which, also, I have been accused of exaggerating, but which I now find recorded as "impolitic," by Sir H. Ward's official advocate. The writer, reporting, I suppose, the feelings of his class, contrives, nevertheless, to throw the blame upon the officers of Her Majesty's troops! For he expressly says, "Sir H. Ward is not responsible for the *summary* floggings inflicted by the commanders of military detachments in the remote villages of the island" (p. 92).

Now, I will not go into this argument, because it is quite certain that, since Sir H. Ward and Earl Grey have both approved these doings in their mutual Despatches, they must, therefore, bear the responsibility and the shame of these disgraceful outrages on humanity—outrages which Greek honour, humiliated, will never pardon. Sir H. Ward, however, when he let loose the dogs of war, and ordered martial law to be proclaimed, could not have been ignorant of what must necessarily follow.

What sort of law, and what kind of mercy it is that regulates the practice of Courts-martial in a "disturbed" district, is now known to the British public from the letter of Colonel Drought to Captain Watson, as quoted in the evidence of the Ceylon Inquiry Committee:—

"Dear Watson,

" * * * I wish you to explain to your officers at Metelle that I am surprised they did not sentence the four persons to be executed. A

plunderer in these times is a miscreant in the double capacity of a rebel and a felon, who would, if he could, first take your life, and then your property. Remind them that all engaged as those were are rebels, and that all rebels should suffer death. Sir R. Oliphant has given it as his opinion, that we are dealing delicately with the rascals, and that a great deal *too much time is taken in detailing evidence*. The Court have, *under the present law*, merely to satisfy themselves as to the parties being guilty, or, otherwise, find and decide accordingly.

“Yours, T. A. DROUGHT.”

In another note the same Colonel compliments his same friend with:—

“You are getting on swimmingly. * * * Impress on the Court that there is no necessity for taking down the evidence in detail, so that they are satisfied with the guilt or innocence of the individual, that it is *sufficient for them to find and sentence*. This is the law and mode; *have you no case in example on the spot?*”

But, was Sir H. Ward himself behind in this bloody sport? Not he, indeed. I have evidence that he personally hunted the people with the troops, and kicked doors open, and was otherwise active and excited. He was present at a murder, I say the *murder* of two peasants at Trojanata. Let those who desire to know this story refer to the Despatches pp. 20, 21, and read the account given by the Anagenesis; that account, against which Sir H. Ward printed another—a *whole tissue of falsehoods*—in his Despatch, and for publishing which account he banished his brother newspaper editor and proprietor to a rock.

I must assure my English readers, that I am fully aware of the extent to which I expose myself by this assertion, and I hereby publicly declare that I am prepared to prove it by incontrovertible evidence, should the Committee of Inquiry, which Mr. Hume seeks, be granted by the House of Commons.

It was for this, that, on Sir H. Ward's threat to revisit Cephalonia, a poet of Leucadia addressed him in the verses

which will be found in the Appendix with a translation ;* it was for this that, at Argostoli, on the occasion of his expected arrival (which he had the good sense to defer to some time which can never arrive), men and women of the families and the sufferers in Cephalonia had arranged to assemble, dressed in mourning, to accompany him in sad, solemn procession through the streets, where all the houses and shops were to be closed, and the church-bells to be tolling as for the dead !

But, in regard to this martial law, let me ask this scholar, who extenuates the tyrant's bloody guilt, has Sir H. Ward offered any evidence of his having consulted the law officers or judges, or even the Senate, as to the necessity of a measure so extreme ? There was no war ; not one soldier was killed. The English lawyer, Blackstone, tells me that " Martial law ought not to be permitted in time of peace, when the King's Courts are open to all persons to receive justice according to the law of the land."—Now, Cephalonia was at peace, one district only was partially disturbed, the Courts of law were open throughout the island. On what legal principle, then, did this proclamation of martial law take place ? It certainly was not on the plea of necessity.

" The right," says a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, December, 1850 (p. 127), " which a general of a colony has to proclaim martial law over his subjects, may be said to bear a close analogy to the right which an individual, in the absence of legal protection, has to slay an assailant. In both cases the peril must be grave. In both cases all regular means of defence must be exhausted, or beyond reach, before the aggrieved party resorts to extremities."

Now, had " all regular means of defence been exhausted" by Sir H. Ward ? Were they " beyond reach ?" He had 3,000 troops—900 in the island, and the giant fleet of England, " greater than fought the battle of the Nile,"—to do what ? To hunt down less than 60 men,

* See Appendix D.

the majority of them unwilling followers of a brigand and "a robber priest!" "Supported as he was," says the *Morning Chronicle* of October 26, 1850, "by an overwhelming military force, it was impossible to palliate unnecessary severity, for he (Sir H. Ward) could not plead the excuse of necessity."

In short the charges on this point against Sir Henry Ward might almost be set down as precisely the same as those, on which so much has been insisted upon in the instance of Lord Torrington—an unnecessary protraction of martial law, his illegal and sanguinary interference with its administration, and, I am sorry to say, "his violent and cruel conduct, which led to two most sanguinary deaths, if not murders."

The writer says that Sir H. Ward "naturally felt anxious about the exercise of so tremendous a power; and his presence in the island saved many lives." I assert that he had no such motive, nor had his presence such an effect, but quite the contrary, as I have before observed. His motive was a busy, bustling vanity,—a thrusting himself forward to show how a civilian as Lord High Commissioner could be as brave as a military man, whereas, where the military man would have been cool and collected, the civilian was hurried, bustling, excited, and anxious to "show off."

But this pamphleteer—driven from the possibility of defending these atrocious outrages, and having shuffled the responsibility off the shoulders of his principal on to those of the officers of the regiments engaged,—who, he well knows, are now out of the islands, and not likely to see his charge against their honour and humanity—proceeds to argue that such severity, though not justifiable, was, after all, wholesome for the Cephalonians. It ought not to have taken place; but it was fortunate that it did so! The chastisement was not deserved, but it did good, nevertheless! Oh, rare and ingenious device

of the illustrious pedagogue, who flogs his boys round on the Saturday morning, for what they will deserve on the Sunday !

In concluding this portion of my subject, which I have elsewhere* dilated upon at large, I wish my English readers to be made aware that such is the spirit of my countrymen, that there can be no quiet in Cephalonia until Sir H. Ward either retires or is removed. They regard him with the same feelings as the Greeks of the revolution did their tyrants, the Pashas.

I find a very remarkable note at p. 88 of this pamphlet, which may serve as another proof, were it necessary, how determined and rancorous is the hostility with which the Bureaucracy pursue any Ionian who may be bold enough to dispute their power and give public expression to criticism of their administration, more especially one, who devotes himself, as I have done, to the diffusion of information on the affairs of the Ionian Islands amongst the people of this country, and labour to bring to the knowledge of the British public the wrongs done to us by English statesmen, if not under their authority (certainly, if we are to judge from the Despatches), with their sanction and approval.

There is a venom, a malignity, and a falsehood in this writer's personal attack on myself, which goes beyond the license of political antagonism. When men of liberal education differ on political questions, it is not usual for them to throw their fathers and brothers in each others' faces. I could have torn Mr. Bowen's arguments to rags without informing the world that his brother was a rat-catcher (and whether he is so, or is a Peer of the realm, or a broker of ships, or a broker of household furniture, I really am not aware, nor shall I take the trouble to

* See "a Letter to Lord Grey by an Ionian," dated March 16, 1850, in a pamphlet by Lord Charles Fitzroy, entitled, "The Ionian Islands." London, Ridgway, 1850.

ascertain, seeing that Mr. Bowen would be, nevertheless, equally the Rector of the Ionian University, equally the writer of this pamphlet against the Ionians, equally malicious, equally false, and, worse than all, equally dull);—yet does Mr. Bowen go out of his way to inform his readers, in a foot-note, that I am “the brother of a shopkeeper at Corfu.”

I may observe to this gentleman, as Homer makes his hero say to another old woman in one of the same islands:—

Οὐκ ἔτ' ἀπολλήξεις τὸν ἐμὸν γόνον ἐξερέουσα ;
 'Αλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω· ἡ μὲν μ' ἀχέεσσι γε δώσεις
 Πλείουσιν, ἢ ἔχομαι· ἡ γὰρ δίκη, ὅπποτε πάτρης
 'Ης ἀπέησιν ἀνὴρ τόσσον χρόνον, ὅσσον ἐγὼ νῦν.

Hom. Od. T. 166.

“Sir Henry Ward’s principal assailant in the English press is a certain Mr. Papanicolas, the brother of a shopkeeper at Corfu, but long resident in London,” is the observation, with which this Mr. Bowen commences his very gentlemanly attack on me. I am nowise inclined to quarrel with this remark—seeing that there is perhaps no gentleman in England who would object to its being asserted that he was a brother of the Messrs. Longman—did I not recognise the invidious spirit of the writer by the manner in which the word “shopkeeper” is used, as generally understood in this country. I have a brother a lawyer, another a landowner, who pays his 22½ per cent. for his oil, that Mr. Bowen’s salary of £400 a year may be kept up; and a third, till lately, in some minor public office;—why did Mr. Bowen seek out the “shopkeeper?” except that he thought the word had an “unmusical” sound in English society. But I can help Mr. Bowen further, if such be the disparagement he wishes to bring to bear against the political opponents of the Ionian Bureaucracy. To the crime of my having a brother a “shopkeeper,” I must add the ancestral disgrace that my father

also, in the same sense, was a "shopkeeper." He had a shop under his house, and sold goods consigned to him, and traded from sea to sea; and well I remember that spot, for almost my first impression was seeing him surrounded by those champions of liberty, who were fighting against the Turks, during the two days' fight in Corfu, which gave the infidels their last disrelish for affecting the so much talked of *suzeraineté* of the Ionians.

If Mr. Bowen would know how an honest "shopkeeper" may be respected after his death, let him inquire into the memory of my honoured father. If he seek to learn more of my family, he might find it in the written records of Exanthia, a village of Leucadia, generation by generation, for 380 *years*, without a stain upon its spotless honour. There are my forefathers' lands; we have no titles of estate, for we know no aristocracy—we Ionians; the few titles of Counts were originally given by the Venetians for services rendered the republic, in the same manner as General H. Douglas and Mr. Ward were made knights by her Majesty because they were appointed Lord High Commissioners; just as a tallow-chandler or an auctioneer are created Baronets because they happen to be Lord Mayors. When Mr. Bowen, in his classical enthusiasm, shall visit Sappho's Leap, in Leucadia, he will have the further satisfaction that he stands upon the ancestral land of the "shopkeeper;" that near and around, and far as he can see over vineyards (whose wine his "benevolent absence of taxation" prevents us from drinking, by an impost of several dollars on each barrel), over olive-yards (whose produce we may not sell under $18\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty, owing to the same "benevolence"), is my family's property; and that if he wish to give a lesson in his New Greek Grammar to some thousand at once, he has nothing to do but summon the Dracati from the neighbouring villages. He must, however, do this in their own Greek; for, as I am

told, the Greek of the learned votary of Terpsichore is musty, and somewhat unintelligible from his Hibernian pronunciation. Should this wonderful scholar desire more, he may learn that, antecedent to the period above referred to, that family—of the purest Greek blood—migrated from Acarnania, fighting, inch by inch, as driven backwards by the Turks, refusing ever to live in subjection. There is nothing to boast of—as there is nothing to be ashamed of—in this, as far as I myself am concerned. It has been forced upon me, and I merely mention it, that the Irish Rector of the Ionian University, who shudders at the brother of a “shopkeeper” venturing to stand up in his country’s behalf, when he feels her to have been so deeply wronged, may have an opportunity of carrying his genealogical investigation, if he should so wish it, up to the extreme root of history, since he may find a record of our family (*Δράκος*) in the writings of some of his classics, and even in his favourite Thucydides.

When, however, Mr. Bowen speaks invidiously of “shopkeepers,” as in the Ionian Islands, I should wish him to tell the world what employment or occupation his countrymen have left to an honest Ionian, who does not wish to live idly on the labour of others, as a landholder, or a usurious money-lender to a needy peasantry, himself the screwed-down victim of the Ionian Bank! Whither can Ionian talent, or Ionian enterprise, betake itself, if not to trade or commerce? All cannot be lawyers, or physicians, or priests; neither are the emoluments or the salaries of the most eminent in any of these professions by any means an object of ambition. We have no military service. That is occupied by English officers and troops. Our native militia has never been called into existence, beyond the salaries paid to its English officers. Of a navy we have not even the phantom, except two packet-boats, although the neighbourhood of Corfu offers one of the finest harbours, with a noble site for a dockyard, far superior in accommodation

to any that Malta can afford. We are no longer allowed to enter the service of other countries. From every important local office, from every hope of serving another country abroad, the Ionian is excluded. The advantages of the best offices at home are reserved for such genteel English or Irish as Mr. Bowen, who, though they do not like us, have a great regard for our money. What wonder, then, if in the best Ionian families the "shopkeeper" is not seldom to be found? But, that any man in the world, be he gentleman or nobleman of any country, could be in the slightest degree lowered in our estimation, or that of his friends, by occupying the same position as my most excellent brother, the "shopkeeper," and first bookseller at Corfu, I must strenuously deny.

But it would seem that I have myself done worse, in the eyes of this learned Theban. My brother is only charged with selling books; me, he accuses of applying them! Here is the precious accusation.

"During the short period, when it was understood that the present king of Belgium had accepted the crown of Greece, Papanicolas was attached to his staff, in what he himself calls indefinitely 'a confidential situation,' but which is generally believed to have been in the capacity of interpreter, and teacher of modern Greek" (p. 89).

The writer thinks he is lowering my position, but I would as gladly accept the condition which he offers, as that of private secretary, in which character I, virtually, acted towards the Prince during my stay in Paris with his Majesty. On this part of the subject, however, I have already commented in a letter to Sir H. Ward (see Appendix G), which I wrote off, immediately, on perusing the article against me, that appeared in a scurrilous paper at Corfu, got up lately by Sir H. Ward, to abuse the opponents of his government, by attacks on their private character, something after the fashion adopted, some years since, by the infamous parties connected with the *Satirist* in England. The would-be libels of that paper, the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ, are

exactly re-produced by the Rector of the Ionian University in this paragraph. I need not trouble myself with them further than to refer my reader to the reply which I addressed to that paper at the time. (See Appendix H.)

The gist, however, of what Mr. Bowen wishes to be inferred against me is contained in the following paragraph.

“ When Sir H. Ward was appointed to succeed Lord Seaton, he wrote him” (*the Rector of the University, who is not always correct in his “ Eton or Harrow” Grammar, does not mean here that Sir H. Ward wrote to Lord Seaton, but that I wrote to Sir H. Ward*) “ a letter full of the grossest adulation, and ending with a request to be allowed to accompany him to Corfu, in the same confidential situation which he had held under His Majesty the king of the Belgians, as he wished to serve his native country under its first liberal Lord High Commissioner.”

So far as regards “ the grossest adulation,” my correspondence itself, which is added in the same Appendix, is the best reply; but to the charge of having mistaken Sir H. Ward for a liberal, I am afraid I must plead guilty. His reputation as M.P. for Sheffield deceived me, as it had done others. I thought he would be at least consistent then, when ambition had no more in store for him; I was led, indeed, to judge so from his conversation with me. A moment of enthusiasm led me to offer, what would certainly have occasioned me much inconvenience, to accompany him to Corfu, and the serving my country under its first “ liberal Lord High Commissioner.” I wished, it must be confessed, with an honest vanity, to witness the triumph of those liberal principles for which I had so long been struggling. I desired to be present at the first meeting of an Ionian Legislative Assembly freely elected; and I may also have had the vanity to suppose, that some explanations and some personal influence on the part of one who, though he had received an English education, was an Ionian still in point of birth, might have been advantageous to both sides, the English and the Ionians,

in their novel relations under the amended Constitution. Mr. Bowen is quite right, when he states this. But *why* did he state it, without also informing his readers that I *totally disclaimed all pecuniary remuneration or personal advantage of any kind?* Mr. Bowen well knew the effect of such an omission. Can I for an instant suppose he did not wish it to be implied, that I sought office for personal emolument? But "Sir H. Ward," as he tells us, "politely declined this modest offer from a person of whom he knew nothing." So far from declining it politely, the letter never reached Sir H. Ward until his arrival at Corfu, and being then too late, or too occupied with Cephalonians, was never answered; moreover, as regards his "not knowing" me, the letter in question was written immediately after an interview, in which we had conversed on the administration of the Islands. Indeed the liberal sentiments expressed by the new Lord High Commissioner at that time, and his apparent *bienveillance* for my countrymen, were the motives that induced me to wish to serve, for the first time, my country under him.

"Ever since that moment," the venomous slanderer goes on to say, "Papanicolas has constituted himself the London agent of the Ionian agitators, and has applied himself most unweariedly to the task of calumniating his once much-flattered and admired 'first liberal Lord High Commissioner.'"

I can characterize this assertion of "Bowen's" in no milder terms than that of a deliberate and wilful falsehood. I defy him to its proof. My connection with Ionian politics had no reference whatsoever to Sir Henry Ward's period, but was far anterior, dating from my visit to the Islands in 1834, under Lord Nugent, when I suggested the formation of the Ionian Bank, as a means for remedying the many grievances and exactions which the necessitous small landholders were enduring from the exaction of money-lenders, who bought up

their harvests year by year, even before the currant-trees were in blossom; and in 1840, during Sir H. Douglas's administration, that I took no unimportant part in the attempt to procure redress for Ionian complaints from the English government will be evident from the date of my communication to the *Morning Chronicle* of 11th February, 1841, quoted at p. 79, and my letter to Sir H. Douglas at p. 39. I discontinued all interference in Ionian politics during the administration of Mr. Stewart Mackenzie and Lord Seaton, because, in the first instance, every effort was directed to restore the country to a calm state, and in the other, the country once tranquillized, every examination was made into its wants and the requirements of the people; judicial reforms were instituted, the course of improvement marked out, a free press determined upon, and the electoral and legislative reforms initiated. The country was satisfied, the seeds of constitutional reform were sown, and I was silent. So, also, I should have remained, had Sir Henry Ward acted as was to be expected from him; had he carried out the reforms of his predecessor. But, soon after his arrival in Corfu, a rumour reached me that he had set himself to mar the measures of Lord Seaton, and to emasculate all the reforms granted by him. Even upon this, however, I was silent, until the intelligence of that atrocious outrage in Cephalonia, the floggings and the murders under his orders, roused me to vindicate and defend my country, prostrate, wounded, and bleeding, at the feet of a modern Nero.

But did I in this show the haste of gratified malice? Was there anger, was there private feeling against Sir H. Ward? The letter in question was written to him on the 3rd of May, 1849, delivered by myself at the Admiralty, (together with a packet containing all the papers published in London on the state of the Islands since 1840), but just ten minutes after he left for Paris,

and he arrived in Corfu on the 1st of June. My first letter on the subject of the Cephalonia cruelties appeared in the *Daily News* of the 9th of November, 1849.

A mountain of malice could have furnished no such strong cause for oburgation against Sir H. Ward as this affair of Cephalonia; and, surely, that feeling of irritated vanity could not have been very strong, which could lie smouldering from the 3rd of May to the 9th November, at which time, according to Mr. Bowen, it burst into a flame, and has continued blazing ever since.

But I am Sir Henry Ward's "*principal assailant in the English press.*" Does Mr. Bowen call the *Morning Chronicle* no assailant? Let him refer to the leading articles in that liberal paper of the 25th April, 14th May, 24th July, 12th August, 11th and 17th September, 14th and 26th October, 1850. Is the antagonism of the *Daily News* to be despised? I would advise a perusal of the many leading articles of that journal, particularly those of the 15th and 24th October, 14th and 26th November, 1849, those of the 2nd February, 13th March, 5th April, 20th May, 23rd and 24th July, 12th and 20th August, 1850. Let Mr. Bowen read and digest the caustic severity of the *Examiner* (Sir H. Ward's friend); it would be particularly palatable perhaps to his defender, if he were to turn to the number of that paper of the 7th of April, 1850. What, too, becomes of my being the *principal assailant* of Sir H. Ward, when we find the thunders of the *Times* breaking on Sir H. Ward's devoted head in its leading articles of the 27th February, 12th March, 15th April, 12th August, 1850? May I mention the other metropolitan papers, such as the *Sun* of the 23rd October, the *Standard* of the 18th May, the *Spectator* of the 17th March, and even the *Globe* of the 6th May, 1850? Shall I add the long catalogue of the provincial and weekly press, or shall I allude to the legion of the newspapers from France, Germany, Italy, Greece, whose

outcry of execration against Sir H. Ward has filled Europe?

I have extracted the cream of some of those articles as an historical souvenir of Sir H. Ward's government, which may serve as a monument to preserve the future sweetness of his memory. They will be found in Appendix (E); for,—should his Senate (the free elected Assembly being no longer his) fail to vote a statue to commemorate his paternal solicitude to the Ionian people, as they did in the instance of his prototype, Sir H. Douglas,—these newspaper columns will remain more durable testimonies than marble or brass.

So much, then, for my being the principal assailant of this—according to the Rector—cruelly calumniated excellent Lord High Commissioner. Thus, then, because my opinion of Sir H. Ward's conduct to my countrymen coincides with that of every enlightened and independent Englishman, I am therefore to be denounced, by this narrow-minded advocate of a hole-and-corner coterie, as the representative of a party, and the London agent of agitators!

As the charge of my being an agent of the Cephallonian agitators is one which I cannot endure, I will stand upon no ceremony, nor can I be very nice in my expressions on this point. Filled with the indignation which such a charge must inspire in every honest breast, I publicly charge my accuser, Mr. Bowen, the Rector of the Corfu University, as a calumniator and detractor unworthy the connection or the society of gentlemen, and dare him to the proof of this wilfully false assertion.

That I am, or ever have been, the agent of any party or section of the Ionians, much less of the "Ionian agitators," I utterly deny, and I brand again as a calumniator this man, who, having read (and well made use of) my public writings, as well as having "had access to official documents," must be convinced of the contrary. "The Ionian agitators," or ultra liberals, as a party, have not

only repudiated me (which they have done in their writings),* but I have also heard that, on observing the moderation of my prospectus, in 1844, for an Ionian paper to be published in London, my excellent countrymen the Cephalonians burnt it publicly. I never had any connection or correspondence with them, and defy again the slanderer to prove the contrary. I can feel for and excuse every violence of feeling in the Cephalonians, nor wonder that they have returned to the Legislative Assembly a compact body of members, all of the very extreme party, the more especially when it is known, that, while the elections were going on in Cephalonia, the people could witness from their shores the British men-of-war towing Greek vessels as captured prizes from Patras and other places to Corfu, with the flag of Greece flying under the British jack, a spectacle sufficiently exasperating to any of the Greek race. But though I may excuse, I may not act with such men in politics, nor go to the same lengths with them. I have all along sought for the independence, and not the severance, of my country. I have hailed the Treaty of Paris as our Ionian Magna Charta; and my desire is that the Government of Great Britain should be operated upon and influenced,—solely by constitutional remonstrance on the part of the Ionians,—to carry out with loyalty the intention of the Allied Powers towards us, as expressed in that Treaty. I want to see the British administration practical and beneficent, not selfish, theoretical, and mischievous. I wish for the greater diffusion of education and intelligence, the due regulation of the finances, and the restriction of the expenses of the State within its revenues. I should desire the extension of Ionian commerce, and the establishment of Banks for Loans, Insurance, Savings, and Investment. “All this”—I would say to the British Protection—“you might do, and not

* See a pamphlet by their leader, Dr. Elia Zervò Jacovato, entitled *Tà Kεφάλαια* (p. 13).

leave the other undone." But, surely, for saying this, I do not show myself a malignant calumniator of Sir H. Ward, or "the London agent of the Ionian agitators." The fact is, all who oppose the Ionian administration are cried down at once by the men in office as enemies to the British Protection—seditious, intriguing, "*inetti e corrotti*," disaffected, and whatever else may suit the purpose of the Lord High Commissioner for the time being to call them. For my own part, however, and, I may say, that of the enlightened portion of my countrymen generally, we take the same view on this point as the writer of a recent article in the *Edinburgh Review*, when he says (p. 492, No. CXC. April, 1851), in speaking of the Colonies of Great Britain:—

"If indeed it were true, as is often ignorantly alleged, that the Colonies hated Great Britain, and were anxious to cast off their allegiance to her, much might be urged against the policy of retaining unwilling and, therefore, troublesome and dangerous dependencies. But we believe the statement to be the reverse of true. They may hate the Colonial Office: they do not hate England. They are often indignant, and sometimes we think they have been so with justice, at the *vexatious interference*, the *injudicious control*, the *irritating vacillations*, the *sad mistakes* of the authorities at home; they often bluster and sometimes rebel; they nurture in their bosom, as does every community, a noisy knot of turbulent and disaffected men; they talk largely at times of their desire of independence, and occasionally even forget themselves so far as to hint at 'annexation;' but this is the mere effervescence of the political excitement."

What is here predicated of the Colonies in regard to Great Britain, is true of the Ionians in respect to the Protection;—their disaffection is personal to such men as Sir H. Ward, not to the Protection. However rough the Sea, change the Pilot, and all is smooth once more.

But what can be said of a man, who thus, like the Rector of the Ionian University, comes forward with falsehood for the purpose of attaching slander to a political adversary? Is this the grave and learned scholar that should preside over the education of our

youth? I publicly, again and again, brand the writer of this pamphlet as a calumniator, and dare him to the proof.

I will now pass from these personal matters, and even from that of Cephalonia, to the policy adopted by Sir Henry Ward in regard to the first Legislative Assembly, elected under what were supposed to be more liberal institutions. During the whole of the interval previous to the final sanction of the changes by the Privy Council, and prior to the first election by Ballot, the Bureaucracy, who knew the blow aimed at their power, and felt their forces already diminishing, had been busied in procuring modification after modification of the privileges granted by Lord Seaton, until they had effectually emasculated the whole scheme—nothing remaining to preserve its original vigour and intention, but the fortunate innovation of the Ballot—so that, at the very moment when the Bureaucracy was thought to be expiring, it rose from the ground with renewed vigour, reminding me of the forcible observations of an English Newspaper when referring to the Colonial policy of England:—

“ Like the Oak of the poet, every branch which is lopped off from the trunk seems only to add to its vigour,—and Bureaucratic influence never thrives more than when promising suicide, and announcing its proximate extinction. The cause of this singular vitality is to be found in the generality, and even ambiguity, of the terms under which Colonial Reformers have enlisted themselves. Such terms as ‘self-government,’ and ‘local management of local affairs,’ are understood in a different sense by the Colonial Minister and the Colonial public. The Colonial Minister considers that he redeems the pledges which he gave in opposition by giving to the Colonies a more liberal form of Legislature, elective, or partially elective Assemblies, instead of nominated and semi-official Councils. The Colonial public, without disputing the benefits of the change so far as it goes, seek that these newly-created bodies should be invested, not merely with the power of representation, but of free and unshackled legislation. This is no part of the boon which Lord Grey is prepared to concede, and the consequence is, that the public is perplexed with contradictory and irreconcilable statements, the Colonial Minister distinctly asserting, and the Colonial public as distinctly denying, that they are in possession of the power of self-government.”—*Times*, March 20, 1850.

This was exactly our position. In the very moment of our first success we found all the triumphs of victory snatched from our grasp. Sir H. Ward set himself, from the first hour of his arrival, sedulously to carry out the wishes of the Bureaucracy, and adopted the method of administration which they indicated. We have, fortunately, at p. 139 of the "*Ionian Islands under British Protection*," a *résumé* of what is expected by the Ionian Bureaucracy of those who come to them as Lord High Commissioner, and amusing enough it would be, were not the results so melancholy, to mark how all consideration for the Ionians, and all regard to the honourable observance of a Treaty, is set aside by these "men of business :"—

"They must remember," says our author, "that to attempt to conciliate political opponents, who are not to be conciliated by any concession which a Lord High Commissioner is empowered to grant, is merely holding out a premium for agitation. They must exhibit, too, a determination to exercise the powers vested in England by the Treaty of Paris, *without reference to the other contracting Powers*, who have indeed renounced all right of interference. Above all, let not the Government at home fall into the fatal error of imagining that a Protected State, situated as the Ionian Islands now are, can be governed on the same principles as a British Colony, or other integral part of the Empire. At the present moment there are two points which should never be lost sight of in dealing with a large portion of this people. 1. That they hate the English Government. 2. That they *fear* it. It is *only by working on the latter feeling* that the effects of the former can be counteracted. A *foreign* Government can never seek to be loved without putting itself first in a position to be respected."

This is an exact expression of Bureaucratic policy. The only way it seeks to obtain respect is through *fear*! "*Hate*" and "*foreign*" are the only feelings it can recognize towards itself. Never was there a greater scandal on the sentiments of the Ionians. There is not an English gentleman, be he soldier or civilian, who has lived amongst us, who cannot give the lie, from his own personal experience, to this vile calumny.

Such, however, was the lesson taught by the Bureaucracy to Sir Henry Ward, and he aptly carried out their instructions. When the first Assembly met, it was found to have been returned, with the exception of five members, in *unanimous opposition to the Government!* The Ballot-box had effectually spoken the sentiments of all classes, and the Ionian public, almost to a man, rejoiced that it afforded them an opportunity of expressing their real sentiments to Sir Henry Ward on his conduct to the Cephalonians. The writer tells us that the "great majority came up to Corfu already pledged to bitter hostility against the English Government," and that "their first act was a refusal to take the oath of office, avowedly because it implied the *permanence* of British Protection" (p. 96).

Now, the objection of the Assembly to this oath was not of the kind insinuated by this writer, neither was any such purpose "avowed." The oath of 1818 had been forced upon the first Assembly by Sir T. Maitland, and the members who were of his own creation were compelled, "in durezza," to swear whatever he ordered them. This oath, however, the new Assembly declined to take, and Sir H. Ward found it impossible to force them to do so, as he informs Lord Grey in the following very candid paragraph:—

"I thought it prudent rather to suggest difficulties, and to assume the tone of doubt, than that of authority, which I had not the certainty of being able to sustain, since the oath established in 1818 had not the sanction of actual law, and was not rendered obligatory by any act of the Constitution."—Despatch to Earl Grey. Corfu, March 27, 1850.

It must be remembered that this Oath of 1818 concludes with the declared intention of the member swearing it, "to maintain and strengthen the happy and indissoluble bonds established, in virtue of the Treaty of Paris, between the Protecting and Protected States." Now, whatever Ionian could swear this oath must at once concede the whole question of the past and future

of his country. He must renounce and disavow all the principles of the Ionian opposition. He must pronounce the "bonds" to be and to have been "happy," when he himself and all the world, not excepting the English Government itself, knows and declares them to be and to have been otherwise. He must speak of these "bonds" as being "reciprocal, and established in virtue of the Treaty of Paris, between the Protecting and Protected States," when, in fact—from Sir T. Maitland down to the author of the present pamphlet—that Treaty has been declared to be a nullity as regards the Ionians, and only intended by the Great Powers as a means for enabling the British Protection to deal as it pleased with them. The Ionian Legislator, also, who took this oath of 1818, would have had to declare the "bonds" to be "indissoluble;" whereas all politicians know,—what all patriots hope,—that the question of the junction of the Ionian Islands with Greece is only a question of time. The Ionian Islands in "bonds" to Great Britain, and side by side with Greece a free kingdom, are a visible anachronism. The question can only be one of time, convenience, and prudence. Such a separation has already been mooted in the House of Commons; indeed Earl Grey, in his Despatch of August 13, 1849, makes use of this contemplated separation as a threat to the Ionians.

"While," says his Lordship, with much apparent severity, as if holding forth a prospect of our political annihilation *in terrorem*—"While the inhabitants of these Islands continue to desire the Protection of the British Government, they may be assured that it will not be withdrawn; but they will remember, that *their connection with this country was originally established far more for the sake of Ionian than of British interests*, and that it is upon their continuing to value and to support it, that its *being maintained must depend*."

But what is the feeling of Ionians on this point—that feeling which would make a member of the Legislative Assembly swear "to maintain and strengthen the bonds,"

&c., as “indissoluble?” We will let the writer of this pamphlet inform us.

“All members of the Greek family, wheresoever dispersed, cherish a fervent hope that Providence has yet reserved a glorious future for their race. They believe in their national regeneration with almost as intense a faith as that which cheers the breasts of the scattered remnant of Israel. Their prayers and their expectations are, that a day, still hid in the night of time, will dawn at last, when Greek hands will replace the cross on the dome of St. Sophia—that ancient temple of their religion—will drive the infidels from the fair provinces which have been so long desolated by their rude and fanatic tyranny, and will rear once more on the threshold of Europe the glorious fabric of a Greek empire. Again, there certainly exist in the Ionian Islands a few honest enthusiasts, who would add, in addressing an Englishman, arguments to the following effect:—We are deeply grateful to your sovereign. We cannot be ignorant how much we are in advance of our neighbours in all the material elements of civilization. Still we cannot divest ourselves of our natural and laudable desire to be united to our own brethren, now that a Greek State has been erected and guaranteed by the three most powerful nations of the world. We prefer to be badly governed by our own countrymen to being well governed by foreigners. England has little interest, either political or commercial, to retain her hold in any of our islands except in Corfu. Indeed the southern islands are in many ways burdensome to her. Let them add another to the many claims on our gratitude by permitting them to be annexed to Greece.” (Pp. 130-1-2.)

This is plain speaking; I suppose the Rector of the Ionian University knows what he is saying, though how he can reconcile this rhodomontade with his abuse of the members of the Assembly for not swearing “to strengthen the bonds” as “indissoluble” I cannot understand.

As if all were in a conspiracy to lead Ionian feeling astray in pursuit of what at the present period, with the sober views of political experience, I cannot help regarding as an *ignis fatuus* chase,—the annexation with the *kingdom* of Greece,—Sir Henry Ward himself went off into a Hellenic enthusiasm only a few days after this question of the oath had been solved, at the suggestion of M. Mustoxidi, by the members swearing—

"To obey all existing laws, and to respect the constitutional rights of the Protecting Sovereign derived from the relations established in virtue of the Treaty of Paris between the Protecting and Protected States."*

Sir H. Ward, in his reply to the Assembly, observed :—

"It is not for me to speak in the name of the British Crown of that distant future which the address shadows forth, when the scattered members of the Greek race may be re-united in one mighty empire with the consent of the European Powers. But I have no difficulty in expressing my own opinion, that if such an event be within the scope of human contingencies, the Sovereign and the Parliament of England would be equally willing to see the Ionians resume their place as members of the new Power that would then take its place in the policy of the world."—Speech of Sir H. Ward, 13th April, 1850, in reply to the Legislative Assembly, 11th April, 1850.

That to the lecture, or rather oration, with which Sir H. Ward greeted the Assembly on its first meeting, telling them that they should want nothing, but at once proceed to business and set all things to rights, that Assembly should reply with a remonstrance which set forth the wants of the country, and desired an inquiry into what had occurred in Cephalonia, is not to be wondered at; nor, when told that they were to regard as final the late measures (emasculated of all real strength and meaning as they knew them to be), was it to be expected they would be silent and assenting. How did Sir H. Ward meet them on this occasion? With violent oburgation and haughty insolence.† Yet it all turned out hereafter as the Assembly had said, and the result proved that the new reforms could not be practically carried out with the machinery of the old Constitution. The objection of the Assembly was forcibly argued, and found to be correct. I myself, long previous to the appearance of this pamphlet, had stated it in a letter

* See "Papers on Ionian Changes," Aug. 14, 1850, p. 103.

† See "Papers on Recent Changes, &c., Ionian Islands," Aug. 14, 1850, p. 111.

which I addressed to Sir H. Ward, on the 10th of February, 1851.*

“The axiom, that a second political change is not desirable, can only apply when the first has been perfect and complete ; or when, as in your own Reform Bill, a further expansion and freedom of working has been added to a system already liberal in its main parts, and having liberal intentions. It is not so with our Ionian Constitution. That is a mass of incoherent and incongruous parts, each liberal intention having a secret catch or spring directly and purposely obstructive of the tendency with which it is apparently working. The fabric, as a whole, is a *chef-d'œuvre* of absurdity. The reforms introduced into it in 1848, so far from being a new Constitution, are, though in themselves very partial, new elements which can never harmonize with the edifice of those absurdly ridiculous, as well as tyrannical, arrangements of the Constitution of 1817, which still remain in all their essential points. To wish to maintain a state of things so unnatural would be to desire to keep up a state of disorder ; a state of dispute and oppression ; a condition of things so anomalous, that we vainly look for its parallel in modern or in ancient history, unless, perhaps, it may be in some of those new constitutions that have been recently thrown out from the Colonial-office, and are repudiated with one unanimous outcry by every British possession in the three quarters of the globe. Reason and experience, as your Excellency is well aware, already demonstrate that those franchises which have been accorded to us can produce no beneficial result for the people, so long as they are mixed up with the oppressive and absurd institutions that still exist. The practical ameliorations which would seem to be the object of Earl Grey's anxious wishes, and which occupy four-fifths of your Excellency's late speech, can never be carried out under such a monstrous complexity of liberality with despotism. Such practical ameliorations can only be obtained from institutions that are consistently liberal, or, to say the least, consistent with reason.

“Thus, then, with liberty of the press, with freedom of election, with the acknowledged right of our Assembly to regulate the expenses of the State, and vote and refuse the supplies, in the face of your Excellency's observations, strengthened by the authority of Earl Grey, I am, as an Ionian, compelled to come before the English public with the complaint that my countrymen are not in the enjoyment of their just rights and liberties.

“The truth is, as your Excellency knows well from your latest

* See *Daily News*, Wednesday, February 19, 1851.

experience, the whole of the Ionian Constitution is in practice a farce and 'a sham.' When our freely-elected members are assembled together, their session is one of three months out of twenty-four—those three months again being broken up into as many short intervals or fractions of days and weeks as can be conveniently made out of two years. Their powers of Legislature are futile, because the standing Senate and the Lord High Commissioner can, during their long vacations, pass provisional laws without them, and these they must approve when they meet. As for the voting the supplies and examining the finances—there is a counter article in the Constitution, which, according to the recent interpretation of your Excellency, empowers the Senate, first, to propose a Budget, which the Assembly must discuss; secondly, to make up what deficiencies in salaries and allowances, &c., the Assembly may have caused, if the Senate consider the curtailment injudicious; and, finally, should the Assembly decline to pass the Budget proposed to them; the Senate have the power of regulating the expenses of the State on the prorogation of the Assembly which follows their dissent, as a matter of course, according to the former Budget!"

"The first Session," we are told, lasted nearly three months. "During the whole of that period they did not pass one single practical measure." For this good reason, that they were kept waiting for the Budget of the Senate, and had full employment found for them in an examination into the finance accounts, and an invasion by the Senate of their rights of adjudicating upon the election of their own members. But is it true that the Assembly "did nothing?" Did they not endeavour to carry through a law to define and limit the monstrous power of the High Police, which, under Sir T. Maitland's Constitution (continued in the present), afforded the Lord High Commissioner a colourable pretext for considering himself authorized to "arrest and exile individuals without examination or trial; to enter the houses of citizens by day and night, and search them at his pleasure; to proclaim martial law; to administer sanguinary punishments unknown to the laws; to condemn men to flogging or the gallows,—in a word, to arrogate to

himself an absolute right of life and death over the citizens, and to exercise a despotism as unlimited as it is intolerable?" And was not this measure so modified in the Senate, and so mutilated by the Lord High Commissioner, that it made the law it was intended to amend still more arbitrary and tyrannical than before, so as to be, therefore, rejected by the Legislative Assembly?

Several pages of this pamphlet are occupied with scurrilous abuse of the Ionian Legislature, whom it charges "with rioting, particularly in their nocturnal meetings." I should be ashamed to retaliate by suggesting that the writer should take up the London papers of March 21, 1851, and read therein the description of the conduct of a full House of Commons, in a grave debate on a religious question. In the discussion of questions of great excitement, such scenes may sometimes occur, as well in England as in France and the Ionian Islands.

The Assembly and the Senate being in collision as to the right of the Senate to adjudicate upon questions relative to the qualification of members elected to the Assembly, Sir H. Ward, taking part with the Senate, thought proper to prorogue the Assembly for six months. This he did, abruptly and most offensively, an excuse being afforded to him by a motion for a committee of inquiry into the misdoings of his government in Cephalonia. Such a proposal Sir Henry Ward pronounces to be beyond the limits of the power of the Assembly, although no Lord High Commissioner has yet hesitated to seek for and acknowledge the laudatory addresses of the Assembly, of his own creation, whenever occasion made it desirable to elicit an expression which might be represented to the Colonial Office as Ionian public opinion in favour of his measures.

But the Assembly was prorogued; and then came the

Senate with a proposed modification of the Budget of the year's expenses, something that would serve as a pretext for postponing the thorough and complete retrenchment which had been in contemplation, but was got rid of by this convenient prorogation. The Assembly had found an annual deficiency of £19,000 in a yearly revenue of £156,000, and applied themselves vigorously to remedy the deficit and raise a surplus. This they proposed to effect by cutting down all the salaries, and their own emoluments as well as those of the Senate. But when the Assembly was prorogued, which was in fact done to avoid the Budget in question, the Senate took the matter in hand, and proposed another financial plan, by which their own salaries were preserved, and those of the officials, a balance of the revenue being worked out by putting an immediate stop to all road-works, public works, and improvements! Sir H. Ward highly applauded this notion, as it left things just as they were in regard to the British *employés*, and could affect none but the Ionians themselves, who, only, would be the sufferers by the suspension of all local and general improvements. According to the writer of this pamphlet, we should be led to suppose that the Senate and Sir H. Ward took the initiative in these operations for financial amendment; but the fact is, that this proposition, as we shall see hereafter, was in reality intended to obstruct the progress of the very retrenchment which it pretended to desire. It was, in itself, a gross violation of the privilege accorded exclusively to the Assembly by the recent reforms, viz., the discussing and regulating the "ordinary expenses" of the State.

"The Government of Her Britannic Majesty," says Sir H. Ward in his address to the Assembly in November, 1849, "has understood, in consenting to this reform, that it places in the hands of the Assembly the right of controlling the finances of the state in a manner as absolute as the right exercised by the representatives of the people in France and England."

Yet when the Assembly proceeded to the exercise of this right, he met them with an adjournment for six months; a measure which, by a subterfuge, (deduced from a perversion of an article of the Constitution, intended originally to supply any urgent necessity that might arise under extraordinary circumstances), places the Senate in the position of a Legislative Assembly as well as an executive power during the vacation of the Legislative Assembly, and enables that body to make laws, which are put into immediate execution, and remain in force until the Lord High Commissioner may choose to summon the members of the Assembly to give them their full approval. This approval the Assembly must perforce concede, under peril of another prorogation, and a total suspension of all the moral, intellectual, and commercial legislation of the State; for it must be understood that the Senate and the Lord High Commissioner confine themselves always, while the power is in their hands, exclusively to measures of coercion, annoyance, restraint, retrogression, and taxation.

The object of the Senate in proposing a Budget, (by correspondence between their President and Sir H. Ward), was offensive and defensive—the first, as I have observed, in asserting to themselves the financial privileges but recently devolved on the Assembly; the second securing their own emoluments from what they thought too great a depreciation. For the present I will apply myself to the latter.

Mr. Bowen, who winces sorely as the salaries of Ionian (or what should be Ionian) functionaries come into question, says, in speaking of this senatorial Budget:—

“ The reduction was proportionally fair for all classes in the service. The Lord High Commissioner relinquished £500 annually, and the Senators contenting themselves with the third of their former appointments. It cannot be asserted that the old scale of salaries, as fixed by

Sir T. Maitland, was extravagantly high, when we recollect that the expense of living in Corfu is as great as the expense of living at Edinburgh, so far, at least, as the necessities and comforts of life are concerned. The two English judges receive £1,000 each; the two English secretaries £700 each; the Residents, in the larger islands, £600; in the smaller, £300. Is it likely that men of character and ability will consent to expatriate themselves for a smaller remuneration?"

It might appear invidious on my part to deal with that portion of Mr. Bowen's observations which refers to the salaries of the English residents, secretaries, and judges, did I not know that there is a growing opinion, even in this country, that the style and rate of living of the whole community has been worked up to too great a height, and that the salaries and appointments, as well of the judges as of the officials, have been recently, whenever occasion offered, and are still, in progress of being adapted to the requirements of office, and not the false standard of what is called "society." If this anomaly of expense—this indecorous enormity of finance—has been so strongly felt as an impropriety in Great Britain, with her vast resources and many classes of tax-payers; what must it be in the Ionian Islands—where the revenues are small, where each additional impost diminishes the power of payment, and where the taxes fall on one class of the community, the peasantry, which class especially are least able to endure it? Our expenses, in truth, have been measured, not by our own revenues, not by the smallness of the Ionian Islands, but by the grandeur of the power protecting us—the salaries we are called upon to pay for our administration are regulated, not by our means of paying them, but by the wishes, or what the luxurious Rector styles "the necessities and comforts" of those who are to receive them. If English judges and English Secretaries, or English Residents and English Rectors, must have their claret and their newspapers, their

brandy and their buggies, their ladies and their other luxuries; if they must be paid for their promenades on our esplanade, and their pleasure excursions from island to island—surely, of such especially British enjoyments, the British Budget, and not the Ionian, should pay the expenses; especially while hundreds of the better class of Ionian youth, (as Sir H. Ward tells Lord Grey in his despatches), are without employment or occupation. But “how can you expect gentlemen to come over and expatriate themselves for such salaries?” says Mr. Bowen. The answer of the Ionians is ready—

“We do not want these gentlemen to come over. Why should they put themselves to the pain of playing Argonauts to rob us of our golden fleece?—to fill up the very offices that were intended for Ionians? We might have permitted this at first, just by way of example. But we have had the benefit of any example you could set us for now more than thirty years. Let the gentlemen who cannot afford to live as we do, and amongst us, at salaries such as the Ionians can pay, stop at home. When our best barristers, of the highest character, and enjoying the largest practice, can hardly earn three dollars a day, they would surely, with willingness, occupy places now filled by the very second-rate English barristers, who are sent here to preside over our Greek courts, and try Greek causes, without understanding our language or our laws, at £1,000 per annum.”

The fact is, that the Assembly cut down the whole of the salaries of senators, bishops, auditors, and collectors—all but the Rector of the Ionian University (which I may hope has yet to be considered), by nearly one half—*“Hinc illæ lachrymæ!”*

“Sir Thomas Maitland’s allowances,” it is said, “were not extravagantly high.” Let us see how this stands by comparison.—Under the Russian protection, and during the Septinsular Republic, the salary of the President was

1,515 dollars per annum. Sir Thomas Maitland raised it to 6,222! The Senators had 900 dollars per annum. Sir Thomas Maitland increased the amount to 3,111! The legislators had 12,000 dollars annually amongst them. Sir Thomas Maitland made it worth their while to serve his turn by increasing their salaries to 27,000, and paid the amount, not by the session, but annually, which was equivalent to a further increase of one-third! These allowances and perquisites of the Senators, amounting to 400 dollars a month, the Assembly wished to reduce to 120 dollars, as well as their own and those of the other Ionian functionaries in proportion. But this alarmed the Senate and the Bureaucracy, and the Legislative Assembly was prorogued, in such a manner, and so suddenly, as to entitle the Lord High Commissioner to impute to it, in his despatches, the wasting of its session in idle disputations, without having made any progress towards practical results—to brand it as litigious and seditious, and to take upon himself (through the Senate acting under his own advice) solely and absolutely, the legislative, administrative, and executive functions of the State.

Mr. Bowen is ready to defend any abuse, however indefensible. An eager champion of the Bureaucracy, he fights at the poop when they have surrendered at the fore. The salaries of Ionian senators at £600 per annum, the Regents of the island at £400 (the Regent and the Resident, I must inform my English readers, are two distinct persons, there being one in each island at £600 per annum to do the work, and another at £400 to look at him), and the collectors of island revenues, at £300 per annum, (to collect sums averaging from £10,000 per annum to £1,000)—all these inflictions on a community whose whole revenues scarcely exceed £150,000 at the present moment—all these appear highly praiseworthy arrangements to the Rector of our Ionian University. Mr. Bowen is a fresh leech; he is new at his work; but just

come over amongst us ; and can bite and suck freely at his salary, supposing all the while that he is doing the patient good. The old leeches of the Bureaucracy, however, know better. They find the draught comes slowly, that the patient is exhausted, and, therefore, they are getting ready to drop off. They deem it even prudent to begin to talk about retrenchment, and already have allowed their puppet or mouthpiece, the Lord High Commissioner, to speak a few words to this purport.

What do we find Sir H. Ward himself saying when he first addressed the Assembly? In what terms did he then speak of the outrageous prodigality of official expenses and the necessity of economy?

"I have always," he says, "felt that the machinery of Government in these islands is very costly, and that the whole system stands in need of revision. In undertaking this task, which is more peculiarly the duty of the popular branch of the Legislature, I should recommend you to follow the example of countries which have had a large experience in self-government, and to appoint two committees, each consisting of five or seven members,—the one to examine the civil list, and the ordinary and extraordinary expenditure—the other, the duties of which the revenue is composed, and their bearing upon the different classes of the community. * * * * It is the interest of all that the work to be done should be done efficiently, but cheaply ; and that while proper provision is made for sustaining the dignity and independence of the Government, there should be no extravagance and no superfluities ; that the taxes which it is necessary to levy should bear equally upon all ; and that every species of property should be made to assume its share of the enormous burden."—(Papers respecting recent changes, &c., Ionian Islands, presented to the House of Commons, August 14, 1850, p. 105, par. 5.)

The opinion of Earl Grey, to whom the constitutional questions in dispute between the Assembly and Senate had been submitted, proved to be the reverse of that of Sir H. Ward, who was therefore, in common decency, compelled to summon the Ionian Legislature together once more, and to submit to them the Budget. The speech of the Lord High Commissioner on this occasion

was an admirable lecture on the grammar of political economy, and the duties of the members of the Legislature, addressed to men, the greater and more influential part of whom had been statesmen all their lives. Mr. Bowen tells us that it "was the result of six months' personal investigation of the wants and wishes of the several islands," and that it "gave a true picture of the feelings and desires of the people, and presented a plan of action upon which, sooner or later, all Ionians, who really desire the good of their country, must agree." I have read it carefully, and can find no "plan of action," but a recommendation to vote money, and a decrying of all discussion of constitutional changes, as if the Ionian Constitution had been brought to a state of perfection. More than this, the Lord High Commissioner openly avows his wish that the Assembly should avoid any examination into the proper method of working out in practice the reforms lately granted, instructing them to leave the carrying them out to himself and the Senate. All examination, consideration, and remarks upon the acts of the Executive, whether from the press, the people, or the Assembly, he deprecates as either factious or dangerous. Actuated by this feeling, he prepared to put down every inclination of the Assembly towards this sensitive point, on the instant, by directing his Secretary, —who has the privilege of being present at the meeting of the Assembly,—to carry constantly in his pocket a message for a prorogation, to be used at discretion, should any such discussion arise. What happened during this brief session, and how it terminated, I considered it my duty at the time to bring before the English public in a letter addressed to Sir Henry Ward, which appeared in the *Daily News* of February 19th, 1851.

An extract from this letter will succinctly inform my readers what passed at this last session:—

"With this Budget, then (that of the Senate), your Excellency

makes your first great start as a financier in the Ionian Islands ; and, chuckling over your godchild, you introduce it to the Assembly, with an assurance that it is their absolute right and sole privilege to discuss it, modify it, settle it, refuse it, and vote the supplies, as they might best think fit. With this important constitutional privilege you assured them in very fine constitutional language that you could not interfere. Poor innocents! the Assembly believed you. But no sooner had they settled the preliminaries and set to work briskly in the eight short days you had given them for so important an object—no sooner had they suggested that as article 33, sec. 3, chap. 3, gave the Assembly the power to make the Budget—they were inclined to propose one for themselves, and would wish for further time, than down came a message with articles 14, 15, sec. 3, chap. 2, as an answer, declaring that, because the Senate had a right to give their assent to the Budget when voted by the Assembly, therefore the Senate had a right of proposing the Budget, and that the Assembly must discuss it.

“Hereupon the Assembly, after a little grumbling, began to look at the clock of the session, for well they knew that if no Budget were passed, the Senate, according to articles 10 and 16, sec. 3, chap. 2, would carry on the system upon the former monstrous Budget. Thus forewarned, they determined to proceed ; but when they came to propose a reduction in the expenses of the establishment of the Senate, down came a message from the angry Fathers, informing the rude advocates of retrenchment that articles 8 and 12, sec. 3, chap. 2, said the Senate must not be interfered with, and that as they had introduced the Budget, their consent, by art. 29, sec. 3, chap. 3, was requisite to the amendment, and down also at the same time came another message from your Excellency to the staggered Assembly, to tell them that all these salaries of the civil list and British functionaries, all these ‘extraordinary expenses’ which art. 34, sec. 3, chap. 3, told them they were to control, and which they were vainly endeavouring to curtail within the proportions of possible payment, were protected from any such impertinent prunings, as being sheltered by the special Acts of Parliament which established them, and, therefore, placed them beyond the power of the Assembly’s revision.

“The terrified Assembly recoiled from their task. It was on a Sunday—for they worked night and day to get through a business so imperative and so important. They considered and reflected, and finally remonstrated to be immediately prorogued by the message for that purpose which your Excellency’s secretary carried in his pocket. A pretext for this arbitrary and apparently sudden proceeding was afforded by the attempt of a Radical representative to bring forward a repudiated motion for a union with Greece—something similar to that

annually brought on by Mr. John O'Connell for the repeal of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, but which has not yet afforded my Lord John Russell a pretext for dissolving the British Parliament.

"Thus ended your Excellency's first financial campaign in the Ionian Islands. The great practical result obtained is, that your Excellency can now go on just as Sir Howard Douglas did before you; that you can manage the Ionian finances *à discrétion*; that you can pay whom you like any salary you please, and, as the English poet says,

'Like Cato, give your little Senate laws,
And sit attentive to your own applause.'

But, after he had thus abruptly dissolved the Assembly, the Lord High Commissioner,—to the horror of all the Ionian officials,—declared his intention to carry into effect such of the retrenchments proposed by the Assembly as affected Ionian offices. This intention has drawn forth a bitter lamentation on the part of the Rector of the Ionian University, not from any great sympathy, I fear, with the Ionian officials, as all these offices, though open to Ionians, were held by his English countrymen. The salaries of the collector of customs, and of the auditor-general—one of whom has to receive £60,000, paid over to him by his officers, and the other to examine his accounts—were cut down to £125; not, as Mr. Bowen says, because the one was an Englishman, and the other "a devoted friend of the English connection for thirty years;" but because that amount was amply sufficient for the duties they had to perform, and would have been considered a highly satisfactory remuneration by any Ionian holding the office. Although this was accompanied by a reduction of the amounts paid to the dignitaries of their own church, Mr. Bowen persists in denouncing the proceedings of the Assembly, in all these instances of a most necessary reduction, as "extravagant and malignant." Not, however, being able to demonstrate that the public service will be injured, he tells us that,

“ At any rate, the new system will produce much private misery. The position of the Ionians, who have made themselves obnoxious to the dominant party in the Assembly by their long and faithful services under the British Protection, is peculiarly cruel. The posts occupied by some of them have been abolished without any compensation for the incumbents; while the salaries of the rest have been reduced to a mere pittance, on which it is impossible to exist with comfort, or even decency.”

This lamentation of the worthy Mr. Ferguson Bowen, who comes amongst us fresh from the impregnable and the unscathed perquisites of the Fellows of a small Oxford College, reminds me of the famous scene in the fourth book of the Odyssey, where all the company are in tears.

Ὡς φάτο· τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἱμερον ὥρσε γόοιο.
 Κλαῖε μὲν Ἀργεῖη Ἑλένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
 Κλαῖε δὲ Τηλέμαχος τε καὶ Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος·
 Οὐδ' ἄρα Νέστορος νιὸς ἀδακρύτῳ ἔχεν ὄσσε.

Homer. Ody. Δ 183.

It may not be unamusing to notice, at this point, that one of Mr. Bowen's main complaints against the Assembly is founded on their having raised the salaries of one of the masters of the public school of Corfu!

“ On the other hand, a Greek master in the public school of Corfu possessed the double recommendation of near relationship to a leading member of the Assembly, and of having acted for some time as contributor and corrector of the press to the chief opposition Journal. Therefore, the Assembly considered that his salary should be augmented to £180; that is, they voted him a stipend greater than that allowed to all his superiors in the same department, or indeed to many of the judges, secretaries, and other principal functionaries of the Government.”

This comes with a particularly bad grace from Mr. Ferguson Bowen, whose appointment, whose salary, and whose perquisites are a scandal among the Ionians. An unripe scholar—of a pedantry, which reaches almost a

dandyism of philological classicality, “a dancer of polkas, and shooter of quails,” an amateur militia-man, fighting against patriots, the Rector of the Ionian University stands forth in his own person the theme of a hundred satires, and the laughing-stock of English as well as Ionian society in Corfu. And is this the man, receiving £400 a year, with house and grounds, who spends half his time in travelling across Europe, and may be heard of, now in Greece and at Thermopylæ, dying with malaria fever, now “tasting blood” and “smelling roasted flesh” at Vienna,* now crawling about Downing-street,—who, it appears, only visits the scene of his duties to intermix himself most unbecomingly in political disputes, and write pamphlets in abuse of the parents of the youth whom he is paid to instruct,—is this, I may ask, the man to quarrel with the payment of £180, decreed by the Assembly to the head master of the public school at Corfu? But mark the insinuation:

* “H. and I, and some other foreigners, dreadfully exasperated by the treatment we had met with from the rebels, and excited by the ‘pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war,’ offered the General our services, which, as men were scarce, were thankfully accepted, and setting to work in good earnest, under the direction of the Engineer officers, we soon erected—soldiers and civilians working together—a strong breast-plate of paving stones (N.B. Macadamising the streets of the continental cities would most effectually prevent revolutions), from which the six cannon left us swept the bridge with such a murderous fire of grape, that a sally became impossible. Of course, we were fired on continually from the ramparts, and I, for the first time, literally tasted blood, which has daubed my face and clothes, when a round shot carried off the head of an artilleryman by my side. All this time the roar of cannon, the whizzing of rockets, and the roll of musketry in our rear told us that the Hungarian army had joined battle; while in our front, from all the ramparts, tops of houses, and churches, the rebels were firing signal-guns, and waving flags to cheer them on.”—Letter from Vienna in the *Times*, 22nd of November, 1848.

The ridicule with which these warlike exploits of the Rector were received by the officers of the garrison at Corfu, to whom he was proudly relating them, can be easily conceived. (See, also, Appendix (K) on the same subject.)

he is a "contributor and corrector of the press to the chief opposition Journal." I take the term "corrector of the press" to be used with a similar intention, in regard to this gentleman, to that of "shopkeeper," in regard to myself, and I have no doubt it has just the same amount of innate truth, so far as regards the meaning of the term usually adopted in this country. But Mr. Bowen is not so much jealous of the amount of salary paid to a brother-schoolmaster, as that an Ionian should be considered qualified to teach his own countrymen, and that the Assembly should so appreciate his labours as to take care that they were adequately remunerated. If the Rector of the University receive £400, besides a house and garden, what wonder that the Head Master of the chief public school, in the capital Island of the State, should receive £180; but without house and garden? The proportion is even less than it should be,—less, I believe, than it is in this country,—and I regard it as highly to the credit of the Assembly, that, while they cut down all other expenses and salaries, they increased alone the remuneration of their schoolmasters. But Mr. Bowen talks of "the opposition." I know what he means. I have before me the writings of that Ionian Aristophanes,* who has afflicted

* *Διάλογος—Γεώργιος καὶ Μεταπράτης*. Corfu, 1850. These dialogues, which are published in separate sheets at Corfu, are the "Punch" of the Ionian Islands. They are written in the vernacular dialect used by the peasantry, which affords the opportunity of greater humour in expression. Mr. George Ferguson Bowen, whose learning, like his politics and his polkas, appears to be "highly genteel," having, I presume, never read Plautus or Aristophanes, thinks that all Greeks must have spoken as Thucydides wrote, and all Romans conversed after the elegant fashion of Cicero. He, therefore, as soon as he found himself attacked by this Ionian "Punch," sent off, as I am told, copies of the dialogues to his friends in the English universities in pedantic revenge, as a proof of "how the Greek language had degenerated." It is curious to mention that he wilfully omitted to send them the first dialogue, in which the writer had stated that the language he used

our Rector with that new-born disgust for the modern Greek which we find at p. 47, who laughs at the Rector's new Greek Grammar, at his sinecure salary, his perquisites, his valour, and his classical affectations.

Γεωρ.— Εἰς τὰ σωστὰ ὁμιλεῖς ;

Μετα.—'Εγὼ ὁμιλῶ σωστότατα—Δὲν εἶναι Διευθυντῆς

Τῆς δημοσίου ἐκπαιδεύσεως, καὶ δάσκαλος συγχρόνως

'Επάνω εἰς τοὺς δασκάλους μας αὐτὸς ὁ "Αγγλος μόνος

Ποῦ ἐκ τῆς 'Αγγλίας μᾶς ἔστειλαν μὴ μείνωμεν στραβοί ;

Αὐτὸς εἶναι ποῦ σύνθεσε καὶ τὴν γραμματικὴν !!

Γεωρ.—Στοχάσου ὁ 'Αγγολογιώτατος καὶ ποῖον μισθὸν λαμβάνει !

Μετα.—'Εκατὸ ἐξῆντα τάλληρα τὸν κάθε μῆνα πιάνει.

'Εκτὸς δὲ τούτων χαίρεται ἀκόμη ὡς λειψοπροῖκι

Καὶ κῆπον καὶ παλάτιον, χωρὶς κανένα νοῖκι.

Μὴ σοῦ παραξοφαίνεται τῶν "Αγγλων οἱ μισθοὶ

Πρέπει νὰ ᾔναι τριδιπλοί,—ἂν ἔχαι τετραπλοί !!!

Again, we have the same writer wickedly grieving over the depreciation of the language, and uniting with the Rector in his groaning complaint, that the modern Greeks should call an Ass a Donkey!*

Μετα.—Πάλιν καινούρια βάσανα ! πάλιν καινούριον πόνον

Μᾶς μέμφονται, τὸν Γάϊδαρον διότι δὲν λεγομ' "Ονον.

Μᾶς κατακρίνουν, φίλε μου, διότι 'Ελληνικὴν

Διάλεκτον δὲν ἔχομεν, ἀλλὰ χυδαῖκην

Περιγελοῦν τὴν σύνεσιν, αὐτὰ τὰ αἰσθήματά μας

Καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς διαλόγους μας καὶ τὰ ποιήματά μας.

These satires of my countrymen on his pedantry and impertinent presumptions are the true provocations of Mr. Bowen's splenetic attack on us and our Assembly. He revenges himself upon the Ionian people, who ridicule him, by publishing a pamphlet against them;—which, as was not intended for scholars, but for the vulgar. The writer is unknown ; but Sir H. Ward, having come under the lash of this political Greek Junius, is now, as I hear, engaged in a warm persecution of the printer !!

* Γάϊδαρος is an imitation of the braying of a certain long-eared animal, in whose privileges and nomenclature I do not wonder at Mr. Bowen's taking so strong an interest, especially as the *modern Greeks* apply the word to any would-be learned scholar who talks a great deal of nonsense.

the Rector of an University must be supposed to be a dispassionate witness,—will, he knows, produce in this country a certain effect, when Earl Grey and others rise to reply to certain animadversions in the Houses of Parliament:—"Here is (they will say) an important witness, totally uninterested and independent, connected neither with the civil or military Government, a scholar and a gentleman, one who owes his appointment to Lord Seaton. See what *he* tells us about the Ionians."

The question then becomes one, not so much of the facts, as of the quality of the witness; and as those who do not see the pantomime cannot be supposed to know which is the fool when Harlequin and Pierrot are spoken of as the *dramatis personæ*, I will amuse my readers with a translation of a *brochure* that has just reached me from the Islands on the subject of Mr. George Ferguson Bowen's pamphlet. It is entitled, "Qu'est-ce que ce livre? Dialogue avec moi-même." Thus, as we have read what Mr. Bowen says of the Ionians, we shall have an opportunity of seeing what the Ionians say of Mr. Bowen:—

"Well, my friend, what is this pamphlet of this Mr. Anonymous?"

"Nothing more than one of the books after the old fashion; like the *Osteria Magra*, for example, i *Cervelli alla moda*, il *Viaggio d'Arlecchino nel Paese delle pagnotte*," &c. (Punch and Judy, Reynard the Fox, and the like.)

"But, after all, you must, as you promised, give me some little account of it.

"That is very easy. The pamphlet is got up expressly to justify—it may be even said to give a little flattery to—Sir Henry Ward. Whether on this account, or some other, Mr. Anonymous has thought that he could not dispense with finding fault with Lord Seaton. Now, it happens that to find fault with Lord Seaton, it was necessary for him to laud the Constitution of 1817, and also to give, *en passant*, a slap in the face to us Ionians.

"And what, for mercy sake, put it into his head to play such a part?"

"If there is any believing him, he was annoyed at perceiving that

in England they had no exact knowledge of our affairs, and he wished to get up an *errata corrigé* to the speeches made in the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Hume, and the articles that appeared from time to time in the periodical press (p. 2).

"Probably, also, he wished to refute the scandalous article that appeared some time since in the columns of the *Times*? *

"On the contrary, there are in his pamphlet certain opinions which are in marvellous accordance with that article in the *Times*. We might say that the same happy inspiration had dictated one and the other. But to go on with our *exposé*, I must tell you that he has assumed the robes of an advocate to defend the honour of the Lord High Commissioner and of England, which has been attacked, he says, not only by the press of Greece, but by that of England, France, and Germany (pp. 2 and 3).

"Mr. Anonymous surely must be some very valiant advocate?

"Perhaps he is. My only knowledge of him is as a dancer of polkas and a shooter of quails. To defend this calumniated functionary and his insulted country, he proposes to set forth the truth clearly before us.

"I am all ears.

"In the historical part of his book, he recounts to us, with sufficient complacency, and on the authority of certain documents, the deplorable condition of our Islands before Sir Thomas Maitland came down to us, Constitution in hand, from his Sinai. To see in this pamphlet the paternal solicitude of Sir Thomas Maitland is enough to make one weep tears of tenderness. He made voyages among the islands, and almost stretched over to Egypt in search of a good model of government for the use of the Ionians. You can hardly imagine, then, with what *empressement*, according to Mr. Anonymous, our Constitution was received by all men of character and intelligence (p. 13).

* A general opinion prevails in the Islands that we Ionians are indebted to this illustrious warrior, who fought under Jellachitch and Windischgrätz, for a libellous article that appeared in the *Times* of Sept. 17th, 1849, accompanying the intelligence of the disturbances in Cephalonia. I can easily believe this to be the fact, as the libel is so spiteful and particular. No man can tell a man's faults as his mistress, nor any one scandalize the Ionians so amply as the Rector of their University. That the *Times* knew itself to have been misled, is proved by its subsequent silence to my reply in the *Daily News* of 28th Sept., and the *Morning Chronicle* of the 3rd October to that libel, and its subsequent generous mention and defence of the Ionians in several articles.

"And the memorials from Zante? And the troubles in Santa Maura? And——

"All these he omits,—for the sake of brevity. The only serious opposition made to Sir Thomas Maitland was, he says, on the part of Count John Capo d'Istria, a cunning politician, who was himself, at the bottom, convinced of the perfection of our Charter, and consequently made only a mock opposition (p. 23).

"That, indeed, may be called setting forth historical *truths*.

"Observe, too, the judgment he passes on the Ionians, by way of giving a little more *éclat* to the work of Sir Thomas Maitland. 'The Ionians,' he says, 'have no distinct idea of liberty and independence, unless it be the liberty of oppressing the weak, and the independence of acting without the restraint of laws' (p. 14).

"What a pity this author should not be at the head of our Public Instruction!

"What fine lessons of liberty and independence he would give us! He has in his pamphlet some theories on the rights of the strongest side, that would do honour to Ali Pasha (p. 121).

"Probably some day he will write *that* worthy's panegyric.

"It would be truly amusing to repeat to you all the reasons by which, according to our Anonymous, Sir Thomas Maitland found himself obliged, contrary to his own wishes, to raise himself to a dictatorship, and to render himself, as he poetically adds, 'the Alcinous of our modern Corcyra.' 'Sir Thomas Maitland,' says Mr. Anonymous, 'in the presence of the Ionian Assembly, was Ulysses opposed to Thersites' (pp. 16 and 17).

"Verily, that is an eulogium on Sir Thomas Maitland, who knew so well how to choose his men.

"And will you believe that the best quality that he finds in our Constitution is, the absolute authority it has given to the Lord High Commissioner? (p. 17).

"I thought so; he argues like a perfect logician. Go on.

"I cannot, for I find it impossible to tell you all the marvellous qualities he has discovered in that Constitution.

"We know them all pretty well,—from experience.

"And, as witnesses for the truth of what he says, he appeals to the Senators, the Secretaries, the Residents, the Judges, and finally to all the *employés* of the Government,—except the Rector of the University!

"Oh! the good man!

"After this, he speaks somewhat of the amount of the progress made by the Ionians under the Protection (pp. 28, 29).

"I suppose he expected that, during a period of thirty years, we should have remained just as stationary as the Chinese?

"But what much displeases him is the mischievous trick that Lord Seaton has played us, in granting us reforms. The severity with which he passes judgment on this man,—who, in governing our isles, has certainly not dishonoured his country,—is rather a strange feature in one who puts himself forward to defend the honour of England, attacked, as he says, by the press of Europe.

"But, *à propos* of this severity—Is it true that this Mr. Anonymous is a man of whom we knew nothing, and who was invited to our islands by this very Lord Seaton, recommended by him to us, and loaded with a thousand favours by his lordship?

"It is only but too true.

"How then do you account for such ingratitude?

"What shall I tell you? It is part of his plan for flattering Sir Henry Ward. Add to this a little rancour against Lord Seaton. Don't you remember what wicked people said he used to go to church for?

"I understand you.

"And so he justifies them all: the minister and Sir Henry Ward, &c. &c. &c., except Lord Seaton, who, according to him, could not be justified, even by a Bull from the Pope (p. 64 *et seq.*).

"I opine that Lord Seaton can do very well without such justifications.

"Would you like to hear all the evil effects which our Anonymous attributes to freedom of election, the vote by ballot, the liberty of the press, and all the reforms collectively? (p. 71 *et seq.*).

"No, thank you—I have spent time enough in reading the songs sung to the same tune in certain journals.

"Our Anonymous' critical powers go as far as the invitations to a ball, which, at a late period, Lord Seaton sent out in Greek; and he finds them very badly written.

"Probably Lord Seaton had no time to consult a certain Greek Grammar.

"In the heat of his criticism, Mr. Anonymous stumbles upon our Reading Society.

"Does he find anything Russian there?

"Not exactly—He leaves the patent right of that invention to a certain—Mr. Somebody, the classical author of *The Sham Conspiracies Revealed*. But this Society, according to him, is a real *tapis franc*, a Club of *sans-culottes*, in which are united all the *gamins* and 'loose fish' of our Islands. Consequently here is another attack on Lord Seaton for having accepted the banquet offered him by the members of this Club.

"Bah! What would Mr. Bowen, the Rector of the Ionian University,

say to this? He, who entered his name in this Club as a member immediately after the dinner given to Lord Seaton?

"I do not know what the Rector would say,—but probably Mr. Anonymous would reply to him that, in his opinion, Mr. Bowen must be a *gamin*, if not something worse than a *gamin*, for entering such a Society!

"The good, honest fellow! that this Anonymous must be.

"Add now to all this, numerous contradictions, more than enough absurdities, and many fooleries; and you have the pamphlet that Mr. Anonymous wrote 'to be published in an English Review.' (See his Preface.)

"Is it possible that they accept papers of this kind in the English Reviews?

"If we may believe him. Just as much as, if we are to give him credit, that Lord Palmerston is now regarded by the Greeks, the Turks, and the Arabs, as a new Achilles (p. 120).

"By the Turks and the Arabs I may believe, if they know just as much of the history as our Anonymous; but as to the Greeks, I doubt the fact.

"He tells us also, quite seriously, that Admiral Parker is at the present time known among the Greeks by the name of *ὁ φοβερός Θαλασσοκράτωρ* (the Keeper and Lord of the Seas).

"Ah! ah! I should be sorry to wish the Admiral any of the nick-names that his glorious expedition in Greece has brought upon him.*

"Our Anonymous concludes by showing as much care for us as he would for his plum-pudding. Now, says he, what is it that England ought to do with the Ionian Islands? At present they can neither go backwards nor forwards.—We must, therefore, begin a new score—throw the Constitution into the fire, with all its reforms. After this, either give us a permit for a second edition of the Maitland Constitution, corrected from every reform; or, to the great mortification and despair of Count Roma,† to reunite the six islands to Greece, and make Corfu an English colony (pp. 117, 136, 137).

* The Greeks now, in designating the time of Pacifico's claims, speak of it as "*Εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τῆς Παρκερικῆς Πειρατείας*" ("at the time of the Parkerian Piracy"). The epithet would have been more just, had it been applied to Lord Palmerston, in whose hands the gallant admiral was an unwilling instrument.

† The writer here jocularly alludes to the following passage from a despatch of Sir H. Ward to Earl Grey, dated 9th July, 1849. . . .
 "I was told at Zante by Count Roma, long reputed the head of the

“ Ah! ah! ah! I cannot help laughing in his face!” (*Il faut lui rire au nez*).

To return to my subject, I may observe, in conclusion, that the administration of Sir H. Ward since the second prorogation of the Assembly has been marked by a series of acts of unrestrained despotism. The exercise of the right of petitioning against his measures, which he did not at first venture openly to dispute, he caused to be obstructed in every possible manner. In one instance, the notaries, who attested the signatures of the peasantry, —who, though large numbers of them could not write (a circumstance not highly creditable to the paternal influence of the British administration during thirty-five years), yet wished to register their disapprobation of the course pursued towards their countrymen—were punished by the withholding of their licenses. Next, as the arrogance of uncontrolled and irresponsible despotism advanced a further step, a number of respectable and influential persons in Zante and Cephalonia, who had appended their names to a remonstrance, were informed that they had thereby committed a seditious act, and were called upon to put in bail! Some others, who appealed to the laws against this doctrine of constructive sedition, were condemned by the primary authorities to

Greek party in these islands, that if he could believe for one moment that it was the Queen's intention to sanction their union with Greece, he would go himself to London, in spite of his eighty years, to enter his protest against such a step at the foot of Her Majesty's throne, as an act at once of cruelty and of bad faith; and I think it due to Count Roma to record this conversation, because your Lordship may recollect that, under the administration of Sir Howard Douglas, he was an object of so much suspicion, that his house was actually searched by the police, under the idea of discovering proofs there of treasonable designs. But treason at that time was synonymous with a desire for certain changes in the Constitution of 1817, changes which fall infinitely short of those which her Majesty's Representative here has since proposed, &c.

finer, &c., but on further appeal were discharged. What followed? The judges, who decided in their favour and against the Government, were not displaced—that might have led to inquiry in this country—but removed from their jurisdiction to another Island, where they were at a distance from their families and friends, and where the amount of emoluments accruing to them was diminished. When lately the time came round for the meeting of the Assembly, after being prorogued from December to June, Sir H. Ward further prorogued it to December next, assigning as a pretext, that as the session might only last one day, it would entail an expense of 3,000 dollars on the State, and therefore he would do without it. Thus though the Constitution expressly declared that no prorogation should endure beyond six months, he assumed the right, by a subterfuge, of virtually proroguing it altogether, and vesting the whole legislative and executive authority in himself and his creatures—the Senate. The Ionians remonstrate, but in vain. Our government is one of perpetual subterfuges; and our Constitution, as administered, is so expansive, as to allow of every species of trickery and manœuvre, to defeat the operation of even the phantasmagoric shadow of liberty which it exhibits to us. This is at the foundation of all our bad government, and this is at the bottom of every complaint from the Ionians.

What is the remedy proposed by this writer?—the revocation of all reform, and a return to the old system. “You have conceded too much already,” says this learned *Bavard* to the British protection; “call back all you have conceded, and resume, or, if you never before possessed it, assume at once an arbitrary power.” Let us hear the precious proposition which this *Ciarlone* sets forth as deserving the attention of the Colonial Office.

“There is one principle on which all great nations in all ages of the world have acted with unswerving steadiness; nor can it be well dis-

puted in the present unsettled condition of public law. It is this principle ;—that where an ambiguous question arises between a strong and a weak State, there is, if they cannot come to a friendly agreement, no appeal, except to force, and that the opinion of the strongest must prevail. Now the Queen of Great Britain is, by solemn treaty, the exclusive Protectress of the Ionians. She has entered into a compact with them as to the manner in which her protection is to be exercised. But the parties to this compact—the Protectress and the Protected—have differed beyond reasonable hope of reconciliation. Who, then, must decide the difference ? The answer is clear—the strongest !”

But, surely, the Ionians might argue that Great Britain is only the exclusive Protectress when she performs the stipulations of the treaty. Surely there are more parties to the compact than even the Protector and the Protected—the Great Powers of Europe who made the treaty, and under the stipulations of that treaty passed the Islands over to the protection of Great Britain. None but a stupid schoolmaster, totally out of his element in the world of politics, could so argue. Sir H. Ward must be ashamed of such defenders. It is the argument of sheer despotism, which dreads or disdains to recognize the reciprocal rights of the Sovereign and the People. In the face of all experience, with the grand acknowledged error of the Cape of Good Hope Council staring him in the face, the learned polka-politician recommends, at p. 125, that a Senate, or Upper House, should be formed, nominated entirely by the Lord High Commissioner ! Yet he acknowledges the Executive Senate, similarly constituted, to be

“ Only the shadow of a shade, — a form which deceives no one, — and therefore causing the Representative of the Queen of England to be virtually brought into perpetual and undignified collision with the Representatives of the Ionian people.”

The revocation of the Constitution, with all its amendments, and the multiplying of jobbers, pensioners, and Government tools, by the appointment of a larger Senate, is the grand political panacea, which this very expe-

rienced pedant holds out for our administration. We have had, it appears, too much liberty all this while. Without a press,—with no power of controlling our own expenditure, — with no right of choosing our own legislature for thirty-five years,—we have contrived, it seems, —we cunning Ionians—to be too free!

Such, then, is to be our government in practice. Let us now see what the gentleman appointed to educate our youth considers should be its *morale*, and what, according to his opinion, is “the straightforward manner” in which “English statesmen” ought “to deal with the people.”

“They must remember, that to attempt to conciliate political opponents, who are not to be conciliated by any concession which a Lord High Commissioner is empowered to grant, is merely holding out a premium to agitation. They must exhibit, too, a determination to exercise the powers vested in England by the Treaty of Paris, without reference to the other contracting Powers, who have indeed expressly renounced all right of interference. Above all, let not the Government at home fall into the fatal error of imagining that a Protected State, situated as the Ionian Islands now are, can be governed on the same principle as a British Colony, or other integral part of the Empire. At the present moment, there are two points, which should never be lost sight of, in dealing with a large portion of this people. 1. That they hate the English Government. 2. That they fear it. It is only by working on the latter feeling that the effects of the former can be counteracted. A foreign Government can never seek to be loved without putting itself first into a condition to be respected (feared)” (p. 139).

Sentiments such as these, worthy of Nadir Shah, or Ali Pasha, put forth in the nineteenth century, require no comment. The writer may consider that they give him the *entrée* to the Colonial Office, and may ensure him some future change from the quiet walks of scholarship to the bustle of a consul-generalship, at which post I am told he aims. But from my own experience of English Statesmen, I find it impossible to imagine that, however highly recommended by the valour, learning, and experience of Mr. Ferguson Bowen, such sentiments can ever be adopted

as the rule and principle of the British Protection in the Ionian Islands.

In the comprehensive range of his vast political views, Mr. Ferguson Bowen intimates his notion of the desirability of annexing five out of the seven Islands of the Ionian States to Greece, and the putting Corfu into John Bull's left-hand pocket as an English colony! He discovers, however, one great obstacle to this statesman-like arrangement, in the Treaty of Paris, which he allows to prevail thus far, that "England must deal with them (the Islands) as a whole, otherwise she has no right to deal with them at all." Now, if Mr. Bowen can follow out a logical deduction, he must feel obliged to admit that England is also bound to observe that treaty *as a whole*; and that if a change of territorial arrangement constitutes such a violation of the treaty as would deprive her of "the right to deal with them at all," the non-performance by her of the stipulations fixed by the parties to the Treaty in regard to her Protecting these Islands for the benefit of the people, is equally a violation of that treaty, and equally endangers her "right to deal with them." In the one case, he acknowledges that there are existing parties who would have a right to require the exact performance of that Treaty,—and why not in the other? Are, then, the Ionians so very wrong on the abundant recurrence of certain extreme cases — as the late savage atrocities in Cephallonia — for attempting or hinting at the possibility and justice of an appeal to the Great Powers as their last resource? And is it not to the eternal shame and disgrace of the British name that such an appeal should have been brought within the range of possibility? and actually meditated, *from no actual distrust or dislike to the Protection*, but a sore disgust at its administration.

But when Mr. Bowen talks of separating the Islands,

and withdrawing them from their connection with Great Britain, has he ever considered that the large majority of the Ionians—that is, the very large majority of all the men of influence, education, and patriotism, who form, as it were, the seat and really governing power of a nation,—are directly opposed to any such views?—that they utterly deprecate any such disruption of a connection, which could have no other operation than that of good, were it but administered even with a moderate portion of justice alone? Does he suppose that a population of 260,000, far in advance,—whether wealth, commerce, or civilization be considered,—of the new kingdom of Greece, are willing to unite themselves for the present to a nation of yet undeveloped resources, overwhelmed with debts, and with commerce crippled by that renowned *θαλασσοκράτωρ*, Admiral Parker, and that “new Achilles of the East,” Lord Palmerston?

I will tell Mr. Ferguson Bowen what would be my own wishes, and what I believe are those of the majority of my fellow-citizens in regard to our country.

1. That the Treaty of Paris should be observed in its truth and simplicity.

2. That the Protection should cease to be an interference and an intermeddling, but become a direction for the benefit of the Protected, and a defence against aggression, such as is that of your Court of Chancery over a ward intrusted to its guardianship.

3. That the Constitution should be worked in good faith—not as a mockery and a subterfuge.

4. That the supervision of the Ionian Islands should be taken out of the Colonial Office (as they are not colonies, and avowedly not regarded as such), and placed (as their position of independent States requires) under the department of the Foreign Office.

5. That the Senate should be chosen by the Assembly,

subject to Her Majesty's approval, and should be responsible to the Assembly for the due administration of their functions.

6. That the sessions of the Parliament should be annual, in place of once in two years; and that no prorogation should endure longer than three months; nor be continued beyond that time, without the assembling the Parliament together for at least one month.

7. That the odious name of Lord High Commissioner, made ominous by the fatal conduct of Sir H. Ward, be for ever abolished, and that of Viceroy, or Lord Lieutenant of Her Majesty substituted.

8. That the system of continually changing such officer with all the consequent changes of systems and ideas of government every five years, be abolished; so that the Ionians may have, at least, an equal chance of the permanence of good government, as well as they had a successive continuance of tyrannical policy.

9. That some attempt should be made to satisfy the discontent felt by all classes of my countrymen at so many of the offices in the administration being filled up by Sicilians, Corsicans, Maltese, and other foreigners, and that the custom of employing or retaining such persons to the displacement of the natives should be discontinued.

10. That the Article of the Constitution which confers on the Lord High Commissioner the monstrous powers of the high police, viz.—the searching the houses in the midst of night—seizing the papers, and imprisoning and exiling the citizens, without inquiry or redress on one part, or responsibility on the other—be at once replaced by a law guaranteeing on one side individual liberty, and on the other the public safety.

11. That the finances, though insignificant, should be properly administered, and really applied, under the control of the Legislative Assembly, to Ionian purposes only, so that the complaint of wasted revenues, and a tax-ridden

people, may never carry out, before astonished Europe, in regard to Englishmen, the words of Penelope against the powerful Island-suitors, who devoured her substance—

“Ὅσσοι γὰρ νήσοισιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι,
Τοί μ’ ἀεκαζομένην μνῶνται, τρύχουσι δὲ οἶκον.

Hom. Od. T. 130, 133.

Thus much I would require for the future from British Statesmen for the Ionians. To my countrymen themselves I would say:—

Be patient, you are too weak. To struggle is impossible, humanly speaking; but a moral force is now acting strongly on your side, even in this country. The justice of our complaints is recognized — public attention has been aroused to our wrongs by those very outrages you so vehemently resent. Whatever official management may for a time avail in the Houses of Parliament, the people of England have given their unanimous verdict in your favour, and the public opinion of England is never very long resisted by its legislators or its ministers. All that remains for us to do is to influence that opinion as far as possible, by publishing our remonstrances in the English language, and forwarding them to this country, so as to be immediately available upon the very parties, whom only it is useful to inform and influence. You, my countrymen, have been firm and enduring thus far—wise, prudent, and sagacious in your councils. Be patient for a short time longer — patient, but not silent — and the victory of our Country will be peacefully ensured.

To you, Oh, learned Rector, and verbose whipper of the latter end of little boys, I would recommend, on parting, the old motto of *Ne sutor ultra*. You have tried shooting, fishing, dancing, and,—as you tell us,—fighting; you have flourished in newspapers, and spat your spite in pamphlets—you have abused us; in fact,

you have done everything but what we pay you to do—*instruct our youth*. May I recommend that you eschew politics and try teaching. May I venture to remark that lying and slandering are not accomplishments befitting the scholastic profession, and that if there be any sight in nature more disgusting than a drunken woman, it is that of a *political schoolmaster*. You have (and may my country you have libelled continue to you) a good salary, a handsome house, a well-stocked garden, and a comfortable provision, very small duties to perform, and very few pupils to require your aid—Let me advise you to be quiet—Enjoy the *tranquilla otia* so much more comfortable than your starveling fellowship at Oxford, or the garret down from which you crawl to Downing Street when in London. Why should you expose yourself to the cannon of Vienna, or the perils of railway-transit across the continent? Why should you mock the Colossus of old, with one foot ever in Corfu, and the other in the south-western corner of Parliament Street, —I should rather say, with one hand groping up your hundreds from our Ionian pockets, and the other held out to beg a few halfpence from the charity of Earl Grey? Why not write another Greek Grammar, since your first was so great a failure; or treat us to a folio volume on the strength of the particle *τε*, with animadversions on our incorrectness in “calling an ass a donkey?” Such would be an appropriate task for your great intellect, worthy your illustrious “small college,” and that pettifogging scholarship which is your boast. But as for the rest—a word of serious advice in your ear, which you may receive as the first and last lesson from an Ionian—a lesson taken from the golden sentences of Pythagoras—

Πρῆσσε δὲ μηδὲν τῶν μὴ πίστασαι· ἀλλὰ διδάσκειν ὅσα χρῆων· καὶ
τερπνότερον βίον ὧδε διᾶξεις.

May you profit by it.

For myself I may say that, having been prepared from the beginning,—when I adopted a moderate course, and endeavoured, in calm language, to make both the protecting Power and the protected People better acquainted with each other, by explaining, according to my impression, the true position occupied by the one, and the requirements of the other,—I had prepared myself, I say, to bear the brunt of an attack from both sides. To the Ionians I am misrepresented as an aspirer after place at their expense! To the Government of this country I am pointed out (thank God, only by the Rector!) as an organ of a faction, and an enemy of the Protection. I may, therefore, be pardoned, if I avail myself of this present opportunity, to declare publicly, that I knew no party whatever, in either country; that I never even saw or spoke in my life to any Lord High Commissioner, except Lord Nugent, and that was *en passant*; and Mr. Ward in the Admiralty, with whom I had a short conversation just a few hours previous to his departure the same day. I have always thought and acted on my own impulse, and wrote on my own conviction and responsibility; and, as regards my countrymen, I have had no correspondence with them for the last ten years; only, during the last twelve months, I have been honoured by the notice of two of the most strenuous supporters of the Protection. The documentary evidence furnished to me by the printed parliamentary papers was the base on which I throughout worked their advocacy.

I consider, moreover, that I can make no better return to England for the education I owe her at the instance of one of her highest nobles, than by devoting myself to bringing about a better understanding between her and my countrymen, whom she undertook to protect, by making plain the misuse that has been made of her influence and authority by those sent out to administer it in the Ionian Islands.

One word to Englishmen,—If you would wipe off from the British name the greatest disgrace of which it is susceptible—the oppression of the weak—if you regard the honour of your nation throughout Europe,—if freedom, if right, if justice, if truth, if honour, if the sacred obligation of treaties avail with you, impress upon your Legislators, and through them upon your Ministers, the absolute necessity of an immediate alteration in the method of their administration of the Ionian Islands, of which there is not one citizen now living under the curse of the tyrannical despotism of England's Representative, Sir Henry Ward, who may not address Great Britain in the very same words which the old native of Cuba addressed to the first Spanish invaders of that island.

. “You are come into these countries with a force against which, were we inclined to resist, resistance would be folly. We are all, therefore, at your mercy. But if you are men subject to mortality like ourselves, you cannot but know that after this life there is another, wherein a very different portion is allotted to good and bad men. If, therefore, you expect to die, and believe with us that every one is to be rewarded in a future state according to his conduct in the present, you will do no hurt to those who do no hurt to you.”

It would indeed be a matter of deep regret were the Ionian Islands to possess the sympathy of the whole of Europe, with the simple exception of the Great Maritime Power who accepted and fills the office of Protector.

. θεοὶ δ' ἐλάϊρον ἅπαντες,
 . . . Νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος.

Hom. Od. A. 19, 20.

APPENDIX.

(A.)

IONIAN ISLANDS AND THE GREAT EXHIBITION.

To the Editor of the DAILY NEWS.

Sir,

"Save me from my friends," says the well-known sentiment of a sententious wit. "Protect us from our protectors," is the cry of the too well-guarded Ionians under the auspices of Sir H. Ward.

For thirty-five years, while her neighbours of Europe and even Asia were fast advancing in civilization and prosperity, the genius of the Septinsular Republic has been sleeping one long dull slumber under the British Oak; and now, that the whole world has set out on a grand race to the Great Exhibition of 1851; now, that every shore and island, from ice-bound Greenland to far Cathay, are sending their products or their handiworks to this grand show of all nations, the Ionian Islands, of all the possessions, dominions, and colonies of Great Britain,—the Ionian Islands alone,—although situated in the most luxuriant latitude of Europe, will remain unrepresented.

So far, then, as regards these, once the richest, the most intelligent, the bravest and the noblest islands in the Mediterranean, they might as well have been buried in the ocean fifty fathoms deep, for all that their industry, the intelligence, the activity, and the enterprise of their people, will show of their fruits at the Great Exhibition.

This lamentable vacancy in the long range of shelves and counters devoted to the British possessions in the fairy halls of that magnificent structure must not, however, be attributed to any supineness on the part of the Ionians, but to the culpable indifference of those who rule them. We are, it would seem, governed and taxed only to keep up English regiments, and pay enormous salaries to statesmen who may find it convenient or healthful to seek retirement. The English young gentlemen who lounge on our esplanade, and loll in the bureaux of our administration, what care they for the low pursuits of trade, or the dull aspirations of commerce? Ships with them are mere vehicles

to be taxed according to their tonnage, and trade and commerce but food for constant dues. The people speak Greek—so much the worse for them ; and who is to learn their modern Greek to translate news about the Great Exhibition for them ? And so no notice has been taken of it—no official report sent round by their governor, as has been the case in all the British possessions ; nor any mention made of it in the speeches of the Lord High Commissioner to the Assembly. The Ionian people knew nothing of the world's great wonder, and the vast benefits opened by it to all the world's industry, simply because, being under British Protection, the Proconsul, who rules them, thought them beyond notice amongst the nations of the earth !

As a proof that I am not overstating the fact of this gross neglect on the part of Sir H. Ward, as Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, I beg to enclose you copies of a correspondence which has just taken place on this subject with the Royal Commission ; by which it appears that the government of the Ionian Islands, *i. e.* Sir H. Ward, “ notified some considerable time since that no space would be required for the Islands ;” consequently, no space has been allotted for them.

Of the singular injustice done in this instance to the skill, industry, and products of the Ionians, I need not speak further to your intelligent readers. It will not be difficult for them to imagine how mortifying it must be to the Ionian, when he reads in the government paper of the great benefits and blessings conferred on his countrymen by British government, and hears a British minister get up in the House of Commons to vaunt and laud the tender care of their interests shown by the present Lord High Commissioner, whom he knew to have imprisoned, hung, and flogged them at discretion. They can imagine, I say, how mortified an Ionian must be at reading and hearing this, and being expected to believe it, when he knows that, in a matter so important to the commercial interests, if not to the personal feeling and jealous pride of his countrymen, so utter a carelessness, so supine an indifference, has been exhibited by the “ great practical economist” and liberal-minded statesman, who now wields his lash over the destinies and the backs of the prostrated Ionians.

In conclusion, I may ask what will be the feelings of the illustrious prince, who originated this great exhibition of the products and industry of all nations, when he finds that the only part of Europe unrepresented are those very islands, in which his august consort has a personal interest as their protectress ? “ What,” it will be asked, in high places, “ could not even a few feet of space have been filled with their currants and their oil, that, at least, the name of the Ionian Islands might have appeared in the catalogue of nations ? In truth, a most unworthy representative have we chosen to give expression to

our good feeling and our good wishes towards the benefit and prosperity of a people committed to our charge by a solemn treaty of the sovereigns of Europe."

Such, I doubt not, will be the feeling, if not the expressions of our gracious protectress; a sentiment which will find an echo in the breast of every Ionian, when he perceives his country postponed to all the world in industry, native wealth, and intelligence, solely by too contemptuous indifference to her interests, or ignorance of her value, displayed by Sir H. Ward.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Erechtheum Club, St. James's-square,

AN IONIAN.

Feb. 20, 1851.

"To the Honourable the Commissioners for the Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations, 1851.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"I have waited until the last moment, and searched the very latest Ionian papers, in the hope of learning that something was to be done in the matter by the government at Corfu, and I am now at this late period induced to come forward from the fact that an opportunity is now afforded to your hon. commission of allotting to the productions of the Ionian Islands a portion of that surplus space left over out of the 1,500 feet granted to Greece, which country, as I learn on the best authority, will not occupy the whole of that space.

"There is yet time, between this and the 1st of May, to send a message and receive back articles for exhibition from the islands; for it would be a grievous thing that the spot in Europe protected by Great Britain should remain even unnoticed in the Exhibition, where all nations will bring either their industry or their products.

"Not having observed in the reports of the proceedings of your Royal Commission any mention of the products of the Ionian Islands, or any reference to the articles likely to be forwarded from those states, I trust that, as an Ionian (whom a sojourn of thirty years in England has made well acquainted with the language), I may be pardoned for drawing upon them your attention.

"The many resources of those islands, I regret to say, remain undeveloped, the attention of the Lord High Commissioner sent there to represent her Majesty, our august protectress, having been directed rather to governing the people (I use a very mild expression) than increasing their commerce, enlarging their products, or improving their general condition. We exported oil and currants centuries ago; we

do no more now, though for thirty-five years we have enjoyed a sure and continual peace under British Protection, and our polity has been during that period totally under the control of British officers.

“ But, on this point, I will be silent, for in this generous and truly cosmopolitan effort of your honourable commission, and its illustrious patron, every thought of the prejudice of politics vanishes. I have only, therefore, to mention that, though not conversant myself with commerce, I can point out—

“ That at Argostoli, in Cephalonia, a cotton cloth, or nankeen of strong fabric, is manufactured, with which, in former times, the Venetians used to clothe their army and navy.

“ That the ancient Tyrian purple is still found on the shores of Meganisi, and is used in dyeing this cloth.

“ That cotton grows in the islands, and that an agricultural society was some years since formed in Cephalonia for the encouragement of the cultivation of sugar and cotton; and that, were proper encouragement given and capital found, the latter article would be grown in very large quantities. The quality is that of the sea-island cotton; and the finest muslin, equal to that of India, might be manufactured from it.

“ That mines of coals and sulphur have been discovered, but left unworked from want of capital, and that quarries of grey marble have also been worked.

“ That the chicory of commerce grows wild in the islands, and may be had for the gathering. It is used in large quantities by the peasantry, under the name of ‘pricalitha.’ That the liquorice root abounds, and that any quantity of what I see here, as Spanish liquorice, could be supplied.

“ That the wines of the country, so famous of old, though considered too delicate to bear a sea voyage, might be made so by common care, and are still, to a small degree, exported.

“ That the Maraschino of Zante and Cephalonia is famous throughout the world; that sweetmeats of remarkable and most exquisite delicacy are a staple manufacture of the islands of Santa Maura and Corfu, and that, were such once introduced to this country, the demand for such an article of luxury and taste would be very great; that the embroidery executed by the Ionian females is famous throughout the East; and that silk stuffs and carpets of goat’s hair, such as are used in the Venetian gondolas, are still a staple produce of Zante, which also produces flax, wool and cotton, pottery and soap.

“ The pitch-wells of Zante would furnish curious specimens, and there are other things which, if opportunity were offered me, I could point out. Should no more competent person have already directed

the attention of your honourable commission to these points, I will write to the islands, bringing the claims and value of the Exhibition under their notice. I am of opinion that some personal interference of this kind will be necessary, since, as I have before observed, in none of the Ionian newspapers have I yet seen any reference to the Exhibition, or explanation of its objects.

"In conclusion, I may add, that I am convinced the Ionians generally would be too happy to have an opportunity of showing their personal loyalty to their gracious Sovereign Protectress, by contributing all in their power to the *éclat* of the Exhibition, so nobly initiated and patronised by her illustrious Consort.

"I have the honour to be,

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"Your most obedient humble Servant,

"*Abingdon-street, Westminster,*

"G. DRACATO PAPANICOLAS."

Feb. 12."

"*Exhibition Building, Feb. 18, 1851.*

"Sir,

"I am directed by the executive committee to thank you for your letter of February 12, respecting the contribution from the Ionian Islands, and to say that it is now, in their opinion, too late to re-open the question, as all the space has been allotted, in consequence of the government of those Islands having some considerable time since notified that none would be required.

"I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

"W. G. DUNCOMBE,

"*G. D. Papanicolas, Esq., Abingdon*

"For Mr. Digby Wyatt."

Street, Westminster."

(B.)

PUBLIC EMPLOYÉS IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS IN THE YEARS 1815 AND 1819.

The number of Englishmen occupying offices in the *military* and *civil* departments of the Islands, from 1817 to 1821, and receiving salaries from the Ionian treasury:—

- 1° In the civil establishment, 46 individuals
[from the high Commissioner, Sir Thomas
Maitland, with £1,000 salary, to Sir Alex-

ander Wood, Ionian Agent in London, with £500 a year], receiving together. . . .	£11,767	5	0	a year.
2° In the naval establishment, 2 persons. . .	464	5	0	„
3° In the military establishment, 14 indi- viduals [from General Sir F. Adam, with £1,000, to Lieutenant Greenwood], receiving	£4,166	7	6	„

Total, 62 Englishmen, with salaries amount-
ing to £16,397 17 6 a year.

N.B. The revenue of the Islands in the year 1817 was £87,979. 1s., or 391,018 dollars; consequently, these sixty-two British employés, alone, absorbed nearly *one-fifth* of the entire income of the State [or 81,990 dollars at 4s. 6d. per dollar].

The total number of Ionians in the *civil* service of their country in the year 1815 [the *military* service did not include one single Ionian], whose salaries exceeded 100 dollars a year was:—

396 Ionian employés, from the President of
the Senate, with 1,515 dollars, to the mes-
sengers at 120 dollars per annum, whose
salaries amounted to a total of 98,164 dollars.

That is to say, these 396 Ionians received amongst them all not much more [difference about 16,000 dollars] than the 62 English employés; an additional proof of the extreme impartiality and justice of the parties intrusted with the administration of the British Protection.

The number of Ionians in the civil service in the year 1819, two years after Sir Thomas Maitland had imposed upon the Islands his Constitution, with salaries of more than 100 dollars per annum, was:—

575 Ionians, receiving salaries [including 8,584 dollars for the
police at Santa Maura, Ithaca, and Cerigo],
to the amount of 221,734 dols. per ann.

Increase of Ionian salaries in four years:—

President of the Senate, from 1,515 dollars in 1815, to 6,222 dollars in 1819.

Senators, from 909 dollars in 1815, to 3,111 dollars in 1819.

And all the rest in proportion.

[Extracted from Parliamentary Returns.]

(C.)

*London, 30th July, 1844,
Erechtheum Club, St. James's Square.*

MY LORD,

It may perhaps in some measure surprise your Lordship, that the Prospectus of the *Ionian*, a Newspaper, having for its express tendency to restrain the exercise of a too dominant authority in the Ionian Islands, should be sent to your Lordship the Lord High Commissioner, and that the party who presumes to place it in your Lordship's hands should, with apparently a still greater presumption, solicit your patronage to the undertaking.

But, my Lord, a higher compliment could not be paid to your administration of that high office. It speaks of universal satisfaction and secure content in the exercise of your great power. But, nevertheless, it shows that a remembrance of the past will overshadow the future, even in the peaceful present, for we know that though Sylla preceded Cæsar, yet that Augustus was followed by Tiberius. So, my Lord, conscious as we are that we may not hope for many Lord Seatons to rule over us (though we had a Sir Frederick Adam, equally beloved), yet we are compelled to doubt whether many Sir Howard Douglasses may not yet be in store for the Ionians.

Amongst the many wants and deficiencies of society in the Ionian Islands which must have attracted your Lordship's notice during your residence, the absence of Ionian Literature is not one of the least essential.

Where a book is seen, it is sure to bear the imprint of some Italian city, or Malta, or Athens; and whenever a Newspaper is noticed, we search in vain for the name of Corfu, or any town in our Islands, as the place from whose press it has issued. These Islands, once the seat of learning and the refuge of the Muses, when all around was barbarism, are now constrained to echo the literature and opinions of countries which have advanced during the last twenty years, whilst they themselves have, if not retrograded, remained stationary.

To arouse my countrymen from this disgraceful apathy, to waken their minds to the delights and treasures of British literature and intelligence, by transmitting it in their native language; and that to render them more fully adapted for those liberal institutions which they will surely enjoy under the Protection of Great Britain, and as, I trust, during the reign of our gracious Queen, is the task I have chosen

for myself in conducting "*The Ionian*." This I shall undertake to do without leaning to party or faction (I know of none existing in our Islands), but with reference solely to the political and social good of the Ionians under British Protection. This constitutes my sole aim and object, and in this noble purpose I sincerely trust that I may hope to avail myself of your Lordship's good wishes, as well as of your patronage.

The individual who addresses your Lordship may presume, without self-conceit, to consider himself adapted beyond any other Ionian to this task. A residence of twenty-four years in England, and an education under the auspices of the late Lord Guildford, have enabled me fully to appreciate the blessings of British Protection, and to regard it in the same light as the Chevalier Mustoxidi, whom I am proud to call my friend, and who, in addressing the British Minister for the Colonies in 1839, thus expressed himself:—

"Desidererei la nazionale indipendenza della mia Patria, se questo desiderio non fosse un Utopia. Amandola assai e convinto della sua debolezza, ringrazio la Provvidenza di averla collocata sotto la Protezione Britannica piccolo schifo di sì gran nave sarà sempre condotto a buon porto. Ma perchè questa Protezione sia veramente efficace e salutare, è necessario che le Isole Ionie partecipino d' un graduale e legale miglioramento nelle loro istituzioni in modo corrispondente alle loro idoneità, ai loro diritti ed all' onore stesso della Grande Bretagna."

And this last, my Lord, is the principal object of my paper.

My acquaintance too with English feelings, principles, and politics, has tempered my views, and given me sufficient knowledge of the true interest and position of my country, without in any respect diminishing my affection for her. Thus a desire has grown in me to see the social position of my countrymen advanced by an amelioration of their institutions. Towards this end, my Lord, I will direct all my efforts in conducting this Paper, and in so doing, I hope to meet your Lordship's approbation, and be honoured by your patronage.

I have the honour to be,

Your Lordship's obedient Servant,

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

The Right Honourable Lord Seaton,

&c. &c. &c.

Corfu.

(D.)

SIR HENRY WARD'S DEEDS IN CEPHALONIA,

Celebrated by the Ionian Muse.

Η ΠΕΡΙΟΔΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΑΡΔΟΥ ΤΟ 1850.

Τὰ νερὰ τῆς Μεσογείου κοκκινίζουν ἀπὸ αἷμα
 Τῶν αἰμοχαρῶν χειρῶν σου,
 Καὶ τὰ ὄρη μας ἀκόμη φρικταῖον ῥίπτουν ἐλέμμα
 Εἰς τὸ μαῦρον πρόσωπόν σου—
 Ποῦ λοιπὸν περιπλανᾶσαι; ποῦ ὁ ἄνεμος σὲ φέρει;—
 "Οπου κ' ἂν σὲ φέρῃ, ὅμως
 Νὰ πατήσῃς εἰς τὰ θεῖα τῆς Κεφαλληνίας μέρη,
 Δι' ἐσὲ δὲν εἶναι δρόμος! . .

"ὦ, καὶ πῶς νὰ λησμονήσῃς τὰς φρικτὰς ἐκεῖνας θέσεις,
 Τὸ χυθὲν ἁθῶν αἷμα,
 Τὰς τοσαύτας ἐξορίας καὶ τοσαύτας σου δεσμεύσεις;—
 Καὶ ἂν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον νεῦμα
 Τῶν θυμάτων σου νομίζῃς, ὅτι θέλεις ἀποφύγει
 Τὴν ὀργὴν των—ἀπατᾶσαι!
 "Ἀπαν ἔῃμα σου, Οὐάρδε, τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀποπνίγει,
 Καὶ εἰς ἄβυσσον πλανᾶσαι! . .

Στάσου!... μὴ ἐμπρός! . . δὲν ἑλέπῃς τὰ ἕψηλά ἐκεῖνα ὄρη;—
 Τὸν στρατὸν σου ἐκεῖ ὅλον
 "Ἐχυσες λογχοφοροῦντα, καὶ τὴν Ἑρωῖδα Κόρη
 Ἐκεῖ ἔφραξες μὲ στόλον! . .
 Στάσου! . . δὲν ἀκούεις τάχα πόσα μνήματα, ἑσῶντα,
 Ῥίπτουν κατὰ σοῦ τρομάρας;
 Στάσου! . . δὲν θεωρεῖς τριγύρω πόσα ὀρφανὰ, πινῶντα,
 Πέμπουν κατὰ σοῦ κατάρας;

Καὶ ὅποια τάχα λόγῃ εἰς τὴν φλογερὰν ὁρμὴν των
 Πέρας δύναται νὰ θέσῃ;
 Τὴν, ὡς κεραυνὸν ἔροντῶσαν ἀκατάπαυστον ὀργὴν των,
 Τὶς θνητὸς νὰ περιδέσῃ;
 Κύταξε! — καὶ τίς κυτάζων πτωχὰ τόσα γυμνωμένα,
 Δὲν θέλει ἀναστενάξει,
 Καὶ μὲ μελανὴν τὴν ὄψιν σὲ ἀρπάσ' ἀπ' τὸν αἰχμαῖνα
 Καὶ εἰς τὰ τάρταρα σὲ θάψῃ;

"Αθλιε! . . . ἐκεῖ ἡ Νῆσος δλη μαυροφορεμένη
 Θέλει σοὶ παρουσιάξει
 Κοιμητήριον φρικῶδες, κ' ἡ σκιά της ὀργισμένη
 Θέλει σὲ κατατρομάξει!
 Ποῦ λοιπὸν τὸ ἔθμα φέρεις;—ἰδὲ πρῶτα 'λόγυρά σου
 Καὶ εἰπὲ ἂν ἦναι γλῶσσα,
 'Ἰκανὴ νὰ ἐξυφάνῃ τὰ Νερόνια κακὰ σου
 Καὶ τεχνάσματα τὰ τόσα! . . .

J. Σταματελός.

Λευκὰς, 10 Αὐγούστου, 1850. π.

(Translation.)

THE TOUR OF SIR H. WARD ROUND THE ISLANDS
IN 1850.*

The Mediterranean waters run purple with the gore
 Thy ruthless and blood-loving hands so lavishly did pour;
 And our mountains from their lofty crests all shuddering look down,
 Upon thy livid visage, and in horror seem to frown.

Where, then, wouldst thou wander? Where bid the wind to steer?
 Let it bear thee where it will, so it drive thy prow from here.
 Thou mayst not tread again Cephalonia's sacred strand;
 There, lies not now thy fatal course; for thee ours is no land.

Oh, how canst thou forget the past—those fearful deeds of blood?
 The gore thou'st shed so monstrously—that dread remorseful flood?
 The exiles and the banishments, born of thy tyrant will—
 And of thy prisoned victims how many languish still?

Wouldst thou escape? They hover round thee darkling like a fate,
 And angrily pursue thee, and would seize thee in their hate;
 At every step, at every pause, thy soul would gasp with fear,
 As thou wanderest on to the abyss in shadow yawning near.

Hold!—Advance no farther! See'st thou not yon mountain's height,
 O'er which thou'st poured thy serried host of bayonets glancing bright?
 Look on the heroic Virgin,† as the sea bedews her feet,
 Where you seized and bound, and hedged her round with England's royal fleet.

Hold!—Hear'st thou not the groaning graves that echo thee about,
 As thou tremblest at the rushing of that loud and vengeful shout?
 Hold! See'st thou not the widows pale—the orphans shivering there—
 The homeless and the starving? Hark, their curses fill the air!

* The subject is a threatened visit by Sir H. Ward to Cephalonia while on his tour round the Islands, and the poet indignantly remonstrates, in the name of the Cephalonians, against his outraging their unfortunate land with his presence, after the cruelties perpetrated under his command in repressing the late agitation in that Island.—*Daily News*, 20th December, 1850.

† Cephalonia.

And what avail thy bayonets swift, in all their flaming rush,
That widow's eye to soften, those wailing cries to hush?
That lightning-flashing, thunder-crashing anger of their soul.
What mortal man, with word or sword, hath power to control?

Look round thee! And who, looking round upon that scene of woe,
Can choose but weep to see the ruined wretches perish so?
And, at the madd'ning sight, who would not seize thee by the throat,
And hurl thee down to dread perdition's black profoundest moat?

Oh! wretched man! our island pale and livid in its gore,
A grimly train of phantoms brings thy guilty eyes before;
And her black and angry shadow, cast from down her mountain's height,
Seems lowering down to crush thee, as thou cowerest in thy fright.

Where wilt thou fly? Where turn thy steps? But, first, survey thy crimes;
Say—if there be a tongue amid these sad and blood-stained times
Can tell our Cephalonia's wrongs, and paint thy tyrant part,
And blazon "Ward," who, Nero-like, made cruelty an art!

LEUCADIA, August 10, 1850. (O.S.)

J. STAMATELO.

(E.)

OPINIONS OF THE PUBLIC PRESS OF ENGLAND ON
THE CONDUCT OF SIR H. WARD AS LORD HIGH
COMMISSIONER OF THE IONIAN ISLANDS, EX-
TRACTED FROM THE LEADING JOURNALS.

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 25th April, 1850.

We shudder at the awful measure of retribution which was inflicted by the courts-martial, under the direction of the Lord High Commissioner. Death, transportation, and corporal punishment were awarded to the wretched criminals—in some cases without trial, in others by the rapid process of military law. Of capital executions there were twenty-one, and of other punishments a larger number Major King says that "eighteen persons were flogged in the district of Scala. Those men," he adds, "*from motives of humanity*, were dismissed with a summary punishment, varying from twenty-four to fifty lashes." He [Sir H. Ward] fell into the worse fault of timid men; and by sanctioning severity and cruelty, he has greatly increased the difficulties of government in the Ionian Islands. The most enlightened and powerful of European governments has been exhibited to the world in the act of suppressing an inconsiderable revolt by means which would disgrace a Cossack general, or a Turkish pasha. And whilst Sir Henry Ward was so recklessly inflicting death and stripes

upon the Ionian prisoners, he wrote philosophically of the "*barbarism*" into which the Ionians would relapse in the event of the success of revolutionary and Pan-Hellenist conspiracies The excesses of anarchy could scarcely be more reckless and more intolerable than the course taken by the Lord High Commissioner to restore tranquillity in the Ionian Islands The chief features of the charge against Earl Grey's satrap remain substantially unaltered. Even the elaborate defence of Sir H. Ward shows that the acts which he directed, and for which he is responsible, were needlessly severe, and in some cases unjust. —[Leading article.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 14th May, 1850.

A British governor has permitted and directed measures of extraordinary severity. The official documents throw no light upon these painful occurrences which can induce the reader to pardon or forget so gross a violation of the general rules of humanity and justice But the proceedings in Cephalonia, under martial law, and the atrocities which were perpetrated during the autumn of last year, have met with the approbation of Earl Grey. many capital sentences were carried into effect, many persons were flogged by a summary process, at the discretion of the officer in command, and others were transported. the retribution dealt out by the executive was not only more vigorous but more sweeping than the *dragonnades* of Lourois, or the butcheries of some barbarian generals. The movement bore no political aspect. These facts, however, were not sufficient to appease the anxiety of the Lord High Commissioner, or to induce him to mitigate the severity of his measures. he evinced no disposition to relent; the operation of martial law was continued, the liberty of the press was suspended, and the embargo was strictly maintained. We cannot think that the plea of extreme necessity can be brought forward to justify the conduct of Sir Henry Ward. Neither can we admit an argument he has adduced in his defence. He says: "In taking these steps I have no choice; I have to deal with semi-barbarians." It may be asked whether such a term might not be more justly applied to those Government officers, who directed the infliction of wholesale punishment by the lash? When we examine the enormous number of lashes inflicted upon the prisoners, we find a mixture of cruelty and caprice for which even a barbarian might blush. To maintain the cause of order and civilization by the use of the "cat," is an invention which we should not have looked for from the Liberal ex-member for Sheffield. But whatever

opinion may be entertained in the Colonial Office as to the value of veracity, and as to Sir Henry Ward's method of teaching it, there can be no doubt that these cruel and reckless 'proceedings have excited a general feeling of disgust and abhorrence. Sir H. Ward has proved himself to be utterly destitute of the governing faculty. Whether in his estimate of the predominant feeling of the community intrusted to his charge, or in wielding the executive powers of Government, he has shown himself to be equally incapable. . . . He has dispelled that illusion by the incompetency which he has displayed, under circumstances of no remarkable difficulty. It would be well for the Ionian Islands, and for the honour of the English name, if we had only to charge him with the want of administrative ability. But he is open to a much more serious accusation ; he has trampled justice under foot, and disregarded the dictates of humanity. . . . Such exhibitions of a governor are very indecorous and very foolish, and show that the individual ought never to have been appointed, and ought to be immediately recalled. . . . We pass a very different judgment on the tyranny and violence which have led Sir Henry Ward to sanction the barbarous severity of the courts-martial in Cephalonia.—[Leading Article.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 24th July, 1850.

The papers presented to Parliament furnish, in the most painful manner, evidence sufficient to convict the Lord High Commissioner. His own statements have not only proved his own unfitness for his office, but his reckless disregard of justice and humanity. . . . Although he was convinced that no real danger existed, measures of repression were continued with unabated severity. . . . Capital executions took place under the summary jurisdiction of a military tribunal. Considerable numbers were punished by transportation and flogging. . . . The military reports, and Sir Henry Ward's narrative of his own ridiculous share in the campaign, prove that there was no ground for alarm. . . . Pan-Hellenist societies and the *Fratellanza Universale* haunted his imagination, and perverted his judgment. Under the influence of this terror, he forgot that he was an Englishman, and a servant of the Crown ; and in the atrocity of his sentences, he rivalled the barbarities which the ministerial organs ascribe exclusively to Austrian generals.

There are other parts of his conduct which are equally discreditable. . . . He placed implicit confidence on the hired and secret informer, and, guided only by such testimony, proceeded without hesitation

to commit the most unjustifiable acts of oppression. He has degraded himself, and dishonoured his Government, not less in the choice of his instruments than in the work which he has employed them to perform. The alleged acts which induced the House of Commons to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into Lord Torrington's administration in Ceylon sink into insignificance when compared with the conduct of Sir Henry Ward. However, the expedient devised by ministers has saved for the time Sir Henry Ward, who is thereby left to the undisturbed enjoyment of Lord Grey's approbation. The behaviour of the Lord High Commissioner has alienated the people to such an extent, as to make it impossible to carry on the constitutional government of the Septinsular Republic.—[Leading Art.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 12th August, 1850.

Sir Henry Ward is therefore relieved for the time from the consequences of his misconduct, and he is, moreover, honoured with the priceless distinctions of Lord Grey's approbation and Mr. Hawes's affection. But it was equally incumbent upon the Government of the Ionian Islands to proceed with a due regard for justice and humanity, and not to tarnish the English name by acts of unnecessary and wanton cruelty. Martial law remained in force for nearly two months. The courts-martial despatched their business with fearful rapidity. Capital executions took place, amounting in all to twenty-one; some persons were transported; and a large number—"only about *seventy*," to quote the language of Mr. Hawes—were flogged. They (the events) are recorded in the despatches, as well as Sir Henry Ward's singular admission of the system of espionage which he thought it his duty to put in practice. The idea that was uppermost in his mind was to give a lesson to the Ionians, on the ground that they had misconstrued the leniency with which they had been previously treated. He was therefore determined to intimidate his adversaries—whether brigands or members of the *Fratellanza Universale*—by an exhibition of wholesale punishment. To accomplish this object, he sanctioned acts of the most revolting cruelty, for which he is pronounced by Lord John Russell to have acted like "a man of sense and spirit." Nor can we think that the addresses presented to Sir H. Ward by a few nominees of the government in Cephalonia constitute evidence in his favour which deserves to be considered we cannot attach much value to the favourable opinion of him which is expressed by a small clique. The conclusion irresistibly forced upon the reader by the perusal of those papers

is, that the present Lord High Commissioner is absolutely unfit for the position which he occupies. In the moment of danger, he has been found wanting in judgment, and in the administration of justice he has shown himself deficient in humanity.—[Leading Article.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 11th September, 1850.

Another governor, Sir Henry Ward, High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, has been treated with even greater leniency, although guilty of similar offences. Like Torrington, he adopted the severest measures of repression. He resorted to martial law without remorse, and encouraged the vilest system of espionage. Executions (more than thirty-six) followed each other with fearful rapidity; minor offenders, or supposed offenders, were flogged with the lash. Indiscriminate floggings were inflicted on several hundred persons, without even the forms of any court-martial. The governor behaving with such barbarity, far from being reprimanded, or superseded, was honoured by the Queen's approbation, conveyed to him by Lord Grey. In the number and severity of the punishments, these two governors, comparing the relative magnitude of the insurrection, by far surpassed the rigour ascribed by political antagonists to the Austrian generals in Hungary. Neither Torrington in Ceylon, nor Ward in Cephalonia, had to combat with the difficulties of a real revolution. Yet both employed martial law, floggings, executions, burning of houses, uprooting of trees, &c., for the suppression of a mere agrarian riot. They condemned persons, without a hearing, to death or the cat-o'-nine-tails. . . . Haynau and Welden may have been as cruel as Lord Torrington or Sir H. Ward. . . . Haynau thought that a people who pass over in their colonial governors the unjustifiable executions of British subjects or *protégés* would refrain from assaulting a foreign military officer.—[Leading Article.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 17th September, 1850.

If the Government are so cowardly as to pass over this matter in silence, I trust that when the day comes—and it may come sooner than they expect—when their Wards and Torringtons land on English soil, they will find few to sympathize with the sufferers, and many with the mob, if the Harneys and Ruffys, emboldened to success, mete out the same measure to them, who have deserved it ten times as much as Haynau.—[Letter, signed "O."]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 14th October, 1850.

Our Government has shown itself in the character of a determined and ruthless oppressor, and the conduct of our agents is defended by accusing the Greek population of the savage vices of barbarism. It is precisely the same justification as that which was made by Sir H. Ward when he scourged and shot the Cephalonians on the ground of their supposed inferiority in civilization.—[Leading Article.]

From the MORNING CHRONICLE of the 28th October, 1850.

. he was disturbed in the midst of his studies by an considerable outbreak in Cephalaria. The occasion seemed well fitted to justify the hopes of those who placed their confidence in the moderation of so enlightened a politician as Sir Henry Ward. No one could have dreamed how completely his sense of justice and humanity would fail him in suppressing an agrarian disturbance. It might have seemed far more likely, *à priori*, that an error would be committed on the side of clemency it was incumbent upon the representative of the British Crown to conduct the proceedings against the rioters with every formality of law it was the business of Sir H. Ward, in his treatment of the insurgents, to conform strictly to the law whose authority he sought to maintain. Supported as he was by an overwhelming military force, it was impossible to palliate unnecessary severity, for he could not plead the excuse of necessity. But whilst he was engaged in recommending moderation and legality to the different political parties, he was himself giving a striking proof of the inefficacy of legal obligations in restraining the impulses of fear or vindictiveness. He suppressed the outbreak, but in a manner which has placed him on a level with those whose memories are only kept alive by universal execration. The most severe and the most degrading punishments were unscrupulously inflicted; the forms of law were in many instances omitted; and the claims of mercy and of justice were alike disregarded. We shall not now dwell on the "bloody assize" of Cephalaria But it is at least certain that Sir H. Ward, who was personally cognizant of all the proceedings of the courts-martial in Cephalaria, was in no fit position to conduct the political reforms of the Seven Islands.—[Leading Article.]

From the DAILY NEWS of the 15th and 24th October, 1849.

I have perhaps longed too fondly for a more enlightened system of government in the Ionian Islands, to be considered otherwise than partial in the expression of my indignation at the barbarous, tyrannical treatment that they have met with at the hands of Mr. Ward, their recently-appointed Lord High Commissioner. It is inconceivable to me, whether in the Ionian Islands, Malta, Ceylon, &c., how any Englishmen, who have prided themselves on the conviction that a liberal system of government is the true one, should, when in power, belie all that they have said and written, acting themselves, or supporting in others, the most tyrannical and illegal conduct. What sufficient plea, what right had Mr. Ward, under the circumstances of the case, at once to lay aside all law and justice, and to treat the people of the Ionian like brute beasts, because, forsooth, a party of White Boys had committed very serious (admitted) agrarian outrages? What plea for trampling upon the liberty of the press but just given to a country after thirty-five years of British Protection?—[Letters of Lord Charles Fitz Roy.]

The DAILY NEWS, 14th of November, 1849.

The comments made by foreign newspapers and foreigners in general on Sir H. Ward's proceedings in the Ionian Islands, are rather grating to the self-love of Englishmen. And the worst of it is that they are perfectly just. Galling, though it be to hear the government of England among the Ionians compared with that of Haynau in Hungary, the accuracy of the parallel. Sir H. Ward's timid fancy has pictured to him knots of conspirators and revolutionary movements in every corner. In his fright he is induced to adopt measures for the suppression of the imaginary revolution as remorseless and despotic as have been adopted in Hungary. But in his unreasoning panic, Sir H. G. Ward violated even the slender forms of law which protect personal liberty in the Ionian Islands. the reputation of England has been essentially damaged in the east of Europe, not only by the despotic conduct of those who exercise its authority in the Ionian Islands, but by their uniform readiness to make common cause with neighbouring despotisms, and play the unseemly part of their police agents and spies.—[Leading article.]

The DAILY NEWS, 26th of November, 1849.

As a matter of courtesy it is customary to accompany such statements as impeach the good faith of a neighbouring government, with

an expression of disbelief in them: the absence of any such disclaimer in Sir H. G. Ward's message could not fail, therefore, to assume the appearance of an *inuendo*. In his speech to the Legislative Assembly, he "entirely disclaims any personal imputation;" but that he should have so expressed himself in a public document as to render such a disclaimer necessary, is calculated to lower the public estimate of the degree in which he possesses the tact and caution required in a diplomatist. . . . Sir H. G. Ward's experience and tact as a diplomatist are, however, considerations of infinitely less consequence than his humanity and constitutional principles. . . . On the subject of his floggings in Cephallonia, the governor observes a profound silence; he does not even hint at that branch of the accusations made against him. On the score of unnecessary executions he alleges that, from the 26th of August to the 26th of October, the number of capital punishments inflicted in Cephallonia was only twenty-one. Twenty-one capital punishments arising out of one insurrection, in an island the total population of which does not exceed 70,000, certainly does not look like an error on the side of leniency. . . . The evidence by which Sir H. G. Ward undertakes to prove his humanity is of the scantiest. . . . A dispassionate review of the speech of the Lord High Commissioner compels us to pronounce it one of the most unsatisfactory and discreditable that has ever been addressed to a dependency or colony of Great Britain. Its promises are magniloquent, but studiously vague—obviously with a view to evasion. Its vindication of the excessive severities of the Lord High Commissioner is unconvincing, rested upon bold averments and crimination of others, in support of which not a shadow of proof is offered.—[Leading article.]

The DAILY NEWS, 2nd of February, 1850.

We fear, however, that a feud has arisen between their Majesties of Greece and of Corfu. King Ward, indeed, hinted in one of his proclamations, that the rebels of Cephallonia, whom his Highness flogged and slew, were but agents of some mysterious society, which had its seat and ramifications in Greece. And we hear that Greece and its Court took the liberty of laughing aloud at the ignorance and passion of Sir Henry Ward. That irascible potentate may have retorted by disinterring some defunct claim to the two unheard-of islands.—[Leading article.]

The DAILY NEWS, 13th of March, 1850.

The first thing that this liberal chief of a constitutional government does, is to arm himself with absolute power. . . . This he worthily

follows out by offering a reward for certain supposed criminals to be brought to him alive or dead. Nevertheless, Sir Henry resolved to put down this agrarian riot by martial law, and set out himself with an army to enforce this law but that the circumstances or the revelations warrant the absurd solemnity and the criminal atrocity with which a British governor aped the cruelties and the rigour of Austrian and Russian commanders, no Englishman who has the good fortune to live out of the atmosphere of colonial officials can admit. Sixty-eight persons were tried by court-martial, which acquitted but two. Of these forty-four were condemned to death, and twenty-one hanged and their summary conviction and execution, considering how they were tried, the ignorance and heat of their military judges, strike us, as reflecting strongly on the mercy and consideration of her Majesty's representative.

From the executions we pass to the floggings. Of the sixty-eight tried by court-martial, many were condemned to be flogged, and suffered the apportionment of that penalty. Sir Henry Ward admits that the very atmosphere he lived in was falsehood. Yet he flogged poor prisoners for a fault which it seems was universal. Another man was flogged for not giving up the key of his house. And Sir Henry Ward, her Majesty's Knight and Commissioner, tells that he ordered these floggings "from motives of humanity." And were we, in addition, to place credence in the monstrous nonsense of his excellency's imagination . . . even then we could not but consider the conduct in Cephalonia of Sir Henry Ward, to have been as blindly tyrannical and brutally vindictive as any purveyor of the gallows, or wielder of the cat-o'-nine tails, that ever forfeited the character of liberal, or disgraced the name of Englishman.

When the conduct of Sir Henry Ward, under sanction of our Colonial-office, has enabled the *Times* newspaper to make a comparison between the executions and floggings in Hungary and those in Cephalonia, and is thus enabled to excuse the infamy of a Haynau by the kindred bloodthirstiness of a Ward, the comparison speaks for itself, and must act as a burning brand upon the government that can sanction, or the parliament that can tolerate such acts.—[Leading article.]

The DAILY NEWS, 24th July, 1850.

Sir Henry Ward, on the contrary, puts his sole faith in a few military officers They hang the chief mutineers, and flog the rest; introducing into Cephalonia the unheard of and striking novelty of the British naval cat But the coercion of the whole population in

order to force them to surrender the bandits ; the indiscriminate torturing and flogging of the peasantry,—this conduct alienated and disgusted even those better classes of Cephalonians, whose peace and property Sir Henry Ward pretended to be anxious to protect After enacting Haynau in cruelty, and Schwartzenberg in policy, Sir Henry Ward is unable to imitate even the clemency that Haynau at last resorted to in Hungary. There is not a potentate, from the Adriatic to the Indian Ocean, more despotic, more detested, more extra-constitutional, more the foe of all reform, all economy, and all liberal principle, than Sir Henry Ward.—[Leading article.]

The DAILY NEWS, 12th August, 1850.

We must confess that we never blushed more than when listening to Lord Aberdeen's most just and forcible denunciation of the illiberal and inhuman conduct of a Whig governor of the Ionian Islands, which his lordship contrasted with the mild policy and reforming efforts of the Tory and the soldier, Lord Seaton. And that blush was renewed on hearing Lord John Russell on Friday night volunteer a defence of his friend, "Dead or Alive Ward," whose courts-martial and whose floggings are thus stamped with the approbation of the English champion of civil liberty All Europe hoots at us for the conduct of O'Ferrall and of Ward. The *Times*, with perfect justice, defended the conduct of Haynau in Hungary, by instancing the hangings and floggings of Ward And as to the Ionian press, the liberal Sir Henry Ward made a clean sweep of editors and writers, and thus in fact, made use of his powers to destroy and remove every witness against him Had Sir Henry Ward any sense of his duty as a politician, he would have shrunk from displaying a dependency of England in an anarchic or revolutionary state Instead of this, he trumpets it as a social and political insurrection, puts an interdict on the island, accuses the neighbouring King of Greece, in most insolent language, of fomenting insurrection, and then he gets up the claim of Cervi and Sapienza, to retaliate on the King of Greece, an absurd piece of vengeance, in which Lord Grey had the folly to become an accomplice But the fact is, that fright alone cannot account for Sir Henry Ward's net-work of blunders! There was cowardice in them, indeed, but there was also a strong admixture of vanity, and exuberant desire to enact the hero, and to swell a village-riot into a revolution, for the mere sake of quelling it. When in our own dependencies we adopt their policy (that of Russia and Austria), and emulate their barbarism—when our Governor

excuses his atrocities by saying he has "semi-barbarians" to govern ; [How we should exclaim against such doctrines in the mouth of the Czar!] and when our Prime Minister puts his *probatur* upon all this in the House of Commons.—[Leading article.]

The MANCHESTER EXAMINER, 2nd September, 1850.

Is it nothing that the Island (Cephalonia) is placed under martial-law for more than six weeks? Is it nothing that twenty-one human beings, subjects of, or living under the Protection of Great Britain, are hanged or shot? Is it nothing that ninety-two persons are flogged, and that numbers are imprisoned or banished without trial? The charges brought against Sir Henry Ward were framed from his own despatches to the Colonial-office We are prepared to maintain that the whole case of Mr. Hume is made out by the statements of Sir H. Ward himself But what were the steps taken by the Lord High Commissioner when the disturbances were at an end? He offered the sum of "1,000 dollars for each of the two leaders, Vlacco and Nodaro, if brought in dead or alive!" We cannot sufficiently express our astonishment at this act, or our abhorrence of it. Is a premium to be offered for the murder of men because they are supposed to be, or are known to be, guilty of great crimes? Are courts of law, and judges, and witnesses, to go for nothing in a "republic under British Protection?" This one fact makes any defence of Sir H. Ward impossible Martial-law may be proclaimed, and continued unnecessarily for weeks or months,—gaols may be filled, and scaffolds may run with blood;—but if peace be restored at any price—if the colony or dependency be not actually lost, then the warm approval of the Home Government is the reward of the Governor, whose folly may have created the outbreak, and whose cruelty in suppressing it may have laid the foundation of future troubles.—[Leading article.]

The GLOBE, 6th May, 1850.

But we are bound to express our high astonishment—an astonishment that elsewhere, we conceive, will not be unmingled with indignation—that any English official should have presumed to speak as he [Sir H. Ward] has done, of releasing her Majesty's Ionian subjects from their allegiance. After hinting at the future "when the scattered members of the Greek race may be re-united into one mighty empire," Sir Henry Ward does not think it unbecoming to express his opinion, "that the Sovereign and the Parliament of England would be equally

willing to see the Ionians resume their place as members of that new power." It is impossible to conceive language more curiously fitted than this trashy bombast to stimulate those very delusions of the Ionian race, which are now perplexing Sir Henry Ward's administration.—[Leading article].

The SUN, 23rd October, 1850.

Without altogether exonerating Sir Henry Ward from blame in these transactions, it must be boldly and honestly premised that they have originated in his excellency's anxiety to withstand all efforts at precipitate innovation, and in his stringent endeavours to suppress the disgraceful insurrection in Cephalonia It only remains to be seen whether in striving thus earnestly to vindicate the influence of the treaty of Paris, and to maintain a profound regard for the sway of the protecting sovereignty, Sir Henry Ward may not have, in some measure at least, exceeded the actual requirements of the occasion, mistaking severity for determination, and forcing upon the Ionian Legislature the unwelcome dogmas of finality, instead of a simple recommendation of moderated improvement Henceforth the efforts of the Lord High Commissioner were to be those of intimidating repression The harsh treatment received by the Ionian reformers from his excellency the present Lord High Commissioner, was emphasised in its severity by the yet greater rigour of his behaviour towards the insurgent Cephalonians.—[Leading article].

The EXAMINER, 7th April, 1850.

If Sir Henry Ward is not a Cæsar, it is only because the scale of his exploits happens to be very considerably below his style of narrative Sir Henry Ward's account of his proceedings is a version slightly of the "*Veni, vidi, vici.*" Sir Henry Ward's praises of the conduct of the troops are only to be compared to Major Sturgeon's history of his campaigns Indeed, but for the proverbial truth that "wits jump," we should be disposed to charge Sir Henry Ward with a plagiarism, almost word for word, from Foote :—

"Rebellion's dead, and now I'll go to breakfast,"

Says Tom Thumb the Great, but not so the Lord High Commissioner. Rebellion was dead, but he remitted none of his exertions, relaxed none of his stringent measures. The ruffians Vlacco and Nordaro were not captured, and her Majesty's Lord High Commissioner coolly apprizes

Lord Grey, that he offered, on the part of the Government, 1,000 dollars for each of the two leaders, if brought in alive or dead! That is, he offered 2,000 dollars' reward for the butchery of two men without trial. Why he had them tried afterwards does not appear, as he had incited and authorized the killing of them without any legal proof of their guilt.—[Leading article.]

LE CONSTITUTIONNEL, 29 *Décembre*, 1850.

La situation des serfs de Russie est mille fois préférable à celle des Ioniens, et la population des Sept Iles est unanime pour détester un gouvernement qui frappe d'exil, qui fait pendre ou fouetter, ou envoie aux galères quiconque lui déplaît Le Commissaire actuel Sir Henri Ward, qui s'est acquis par les boucheries de Céphalonie une sanglante célébrité, a jugé à propos de convoquer, il y a quelques mois, le parlement des Iles Ioniennes, parlement où les autorités Anglaises font entrer qui elles veulent Sir Henri Ward ne doit point appréhender le résultat d'une dissolution il n'a rien à craindre du mécontentement public; le traitement terrible infligé à Céphalonie a trop bien appris aux Ioniens le danger d'oublier même un seul jour leur complète impuissance.—[Article du rédacteur.]

The TIMES, 27th *February*, 1850.

The correspondence relating to the Islands of *Cervi* and *Sapienza* demands more serious attention Mr. Ward, indeed, asserts to Lord Grey, that "of the fact that both *Cervi* and *Sapienza* belonged to Venice there is no doubt;" and if the Lord High Commissioner will establish that fact, the whole question is at once decided against the Greeks, even on their own memorandum. But at present we know of no tittle of evidence to support that assertion.—[Leading article.]

The TIMES, 12th *March*, 1850.

By his [Sir H. Ward's] own statement, twenty-one persons were hanged or shot by court-martial, and seventy-three flogged, according to Colonel Trollope's report, "irrespective of courts-martial," with cats expressly supplied for the purpose by Sir William Parker's flagship Sir Henry Ward, or the military commanders in Céphalonie, did what they conceived to be their duty, with considerable more severity than Marshal Radetzky in Lombardy, or than Prince

Satriano in Sicily, and relatively at a far greater cost of life than has taken place in Hungary under Marshal Haynau. The total number of capital executions in Hungary has been fifty-four; that in Cephalaria, an island of only 70,000 inhabitants, twenty-one.—[Leading article.]

The Times, 15th April, 1850.

But the original right which could give validity to such a claim [that of the Ionian Government on the islands of Sapienza and Cervi] was wanting; and though we challenged Sir Henry Ward to produce the grounds of his peremptory assertion that Cervi and Sapienza had belonged to Venice, he has entirely failed to substantiate that essential fact.—[Leading article].

The Times, 12th August, 1850.

. It must not be supposed that there are but thirteen men in the House of Commons, who view with grave dissatisfaction the proceedings of Sir Henry Ward Some of the very men who are so eager to condemn on all other occasions the measures of foreign governments in subduing and punishing insurrections of the most formidable character, were not ashamed to give their vote on Friday evening for the purpose of stifling an inquiry into the conduct of their late colleague, and the present condition of the Ionian Isles The courts-martial then set to work: sixty-eight persons were tried, forty-four of them were sentenced to death, twenty-one were executed, sixteen sentences were commuted, and seven remitted. In addition to this bloody assize, eighty persons were flogged summarily, and received from six to fifty lashes each. A British Lord High Commissioner must have the reputation of a Radical of the purest water to support the responsibility of such acts. In other men, they would be regarded as offences of a deep, if not a heinous character; but the true democratic partisan has a charter from his fellows to hang, draw, and quarter with impunity but it is disingenuous and absurd to assert afterwards that measures of repression were required to punish and repress these accidents, when the cause itself lies untouched. The upshot of the whole proceeding is that this lamentable display of excessive severity has proved not only a crime in the eyes of humanity, but a fault in policy of the grossest kind, for it has concurred, with the more recent attack upon the kingdom of Greece, to embitter the feelings of the whole Greek population against ourselves, and to turn their hopes in the same proportion towards Russia

Will any one contend that, while the other protecting powers of Greece have dedoubled their solicitude for her welfare and their own influence, we have derived any accession of strength, or any claim to the gratitude of Greece, from the brutal transaction in which Sir Henry Ward and Mr. Wyse have been engaged? We can claim little credit for a British Commissioner who proclaims martial-law, and dissolves the Legislative Body, as if he were as much persuaded as the most despotic minister under King Otho, that the Greek people are only to be ruled by the artifices of corruption, or by the terror of arbitrary power.—[Leading article.]

The SPECTATOR, 17th March, 1850.

Why it appears that Lord High Commissioner Ward has thought it necessary to decimate districts of Cephallonia, in order to fight the Philhellenic dogma which has invaded British territory; that in the poverty of his resources, he has been reduced to the desperate expedient of combating the anti-English dogma by severities, which must make the English rule detested as that of alien tyrant and a voluntary hypocrite, who, with protection and liberty on his lips, binds down the struggling opinions of the Islanders under a bloody oppression.—[Leading article.]

(F.)

The Tariff for the Custom duties on importation and exportation was established during the 2nd Session of the 5th Ionian Parliament. This Tariff contains a list of 212 different articles on which the import duties are levied. Such articles even as garlick, vegetables, pickled-eels, chestnuts, chick-pease, onions, oatmeal, lupines, potatoes, salted sprats, melons, pumpkins, apples, pears, old copper, ores, tiles, yellow and red earth, etc. etc., are not excepted, but pay more or less import duties. On the staple produce of the Islands, olive-oil and currants, there is a heavy export duty of 18 per cent. on the value. This export duty, which amounts generally, through an additional per centage levied for the repair of roads, to about $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., must be paid not only on the oil and currants exported to foreign countries, but even when they are destined for home consumption, *and sent from one island to another*. In like manner, the soap manufactured in the Ionian Islands is liable to an export duty of 6 per cent. on the value, whether for exportation or for home consumption. The wines pro-

duced in the islands pay a duty of 2s. and 2s. 6d. per barrel ; beer in bottles 1s. and 1s. 2d. per dozen ; beer in any other vessels 4d. and 5d. per gallon. It would be superfluous to give any further extracts from this official Customs Tariff. Had the Rector, who says, "that fortunately he had access to official documents," only taken the trouble to cast a glance at the long list contained in this document, he might have avoided the untruth contained at page 30 of his work, viz. :—"that with the exception of some trifling fees for stamps, harbour-dues, and the like, the Ionian people pay no taxes whatever." He might, too, have especially informed his readers, that because the Islands do not produce sufficient food for their inhabitants, therefore any importation of eatables is heavily taxed to make them dear, the very garlic and dry olives, as well as salt and dry fish, which form the food of the poor people during the greatest part of the year being taxed from 10 to 15 per cent., while the claret, port, and sherry for the officers of the English garrison is let in at the nominal duty of a penny per bottle !

(G.)

[Private.]

*London, 18th October, 1850,
Erectheum Club, St. James's Square.*

SIR,

. It is, therefore, with much regret that I find myself again so speedily addressing you on a matter entirely personal to *myself*.

Some allusion, in the "*Φίλος του Λαού*," to a private letter I addressed to you a few hours previous to your departure from London, in which, actuated by the enthusiasm which your courteous interview had inspired me that morning, I offered to place my services at your disposal on behalf of my country, has laid me under the charge of being influenced by motives of private disappointment in the course I have adopted in reference to Ionian politics.

The charge assuming, as it does, somewhat of an official form, by its reference to a letter which could not have come under the cognizance of an *ordinary newspaper writer*, I have thought it necessary at once to refute by sending the whole of my correspondence with you at the time to Corfu for publication, and I have done this the more promptly, because I learnt that the same insinuation had been repeated in society by some English officers now in London from the Ionian Islands. For this publication, the indiscretion of some gentlemen, who, I may presume to be in your confidence, is answerable, and not myself ; and

I have only to repeat, that there is not an expression in those letters that I would desire to recall, either in admiration of your political principles, as I *then* knew them, or of hopeful exultation for the prospects of my country under your régime, such as I *then* had reason to expect it would be, and which I know it might have been.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

*To the Right Honourable Sir H. Ward,
Corfu.*

(H.)

On the 14th July, 1850, I had received a newspaper from Corfu, intitled the *Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ* (*the Friend of the People*), the editor of which, as it advocated the cause of the government, appeared to suppose he would be doing Sir H. Ward good service by attacking me. I immediately addressed the following letters to the *Patris* newspaper of Corfu :—

To the Editor of the "PATRIS."

SIR,

Scarcely was the ink dry with which I had written the letter that appeared in the *Daily News* of this day, on the violent prorogation of the Assembly by Sir H. Ward, when a No. of the "Friend of the People" was placed in my hand containing an article evidently written by some person in connection with the Lord High Commissioner, in which reference is made to myself.

I am quite prepared to pay the penalty which every man who interferes in political matters must expect to suffer. I received a warning to this effect from Lord Palmerston some time since, in which his lordship wrote to me as follows: "Persons who mix themselves up in political matters, cannot expect to avoid strictures upon their conduct," &c.

But I am not inclined, nevertheless, to allow any such intentional misrepresentation of my motives or actions to pass without contradiction.

The writer says, in the first place, that I am "your correspondent."

You, sir, are well aware that, throughout the whole of these melancholy proceedings, I have addressed to you the only letter announcing the intended motion of Mr. J. Hume for a commission of enquiry, and which letter appeared in your columns. In fact, the reverse has been the case. It has been my duty to seek in the columns of the *Patris*, matter by a translation of which I might enlighten the public mind of England as to scenes that were being enacted under the authority of her name in Cephalonia. With the rest of Sir H. Ward's policy, I have but faintly interfered.

It is next stated "that I at one time hoped to be Sir H. Ward's private secretary, having generously offered to take that office," &c. This is a gross, and I should be sorry to be compelled to say, a wilful misrepresentation, a contradiction to which must be unnecessary to those who have known for thirty years the independence of my character and my habit of obliging *rather than being obliged*. I must confess that I was so far deceived by the apparent candour and generous professions of so eminent a Liberal as Mr. Ward, of the most liberal sentiments in regard to our country, that in a moment of enthusiasm I offered him my assistance as a private individual in carrying out those generous intentions he professed, in any manner in which it could be made available to my country. But the express condition of that offer was, that this assistance should be honorary and without remuneration, and as a proof I beg to enclose you for publication copies of my letters to Mr. Ward, containing that offer on my part, and in which you will perceive there is not even a mention of secretaryship, or of any other capacity than that confidential one which I held near his Majesty the King of Belgium. Had Sir H. Ward accepted this offer, my conviction is that he would have escaped the snares of the Bureaucracy, and that the horrible cruelties in Cephalonia, which have for ever tarnished his heretofore bright reputation as a liberal statesman, would not have taken place. My second letter, which contains the said offer, was marked "*private*." It has been intimated to me, that the authorship of the article in question is attributed to Sir H. Ward himself. This I cannot believe. His own knowledge would prevent him from attributing such dishonourable motives to my opposition to his policy. He knows that, were he able to make me senator, at a thousand pounds a day, I would not either serve him or assent to his policy. He knows, as the letter I have written him on the 3rd of May will prove sufficiently to my countrymen, the force and feeling with which I urged upon him the necessity of a change in the policy with which the Protection hitherto had administered the Ionian Government, and how earnestly I cautioned him against the acts of that *coterie* by which unfortunately he has been inveigled,

to the utter detriment of his own fame, and the grievous affliction of the unfortunate Cephalonians.

Apart from these personal considerations, I am rejoiced to see the government of Sir H. Ward represented at last by a newspaper, and resorting to other weapons than the cat-o'-nine-tails and the musket, to defend its policy. But, it may be as well at the commencement to give the gentlemen who write for the *Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ*, a hint that something more is required from those who publicly advocate a cause—even though backed by an army and a fleet—than a lofty indifference to the feelings of the people whom they address, a tone of banter, and an audacity of misrepresentation which is only available until refuted, and then recoils on the head of the slanderer.

In regard to the motion of Mr. Hume in our favour, the absorbing nature of the debate on Greece, and the pause in all public business of interest resulting on the ever-to-be-lamented death of Sir R. Peel, have occasioned its postponement for a short period; but the step of justice, though slow, is sure, and the recent measures of Sir H. Ward in the interval have only given additional reason for an enquiry, whether a policy so violent and arbitrary is such as can be countenanced in the representative of Great Britain. That motion, I am happy to say, stands for the 23rd instant.

I write to you in English, that this letter may come under the notice of the several gallant officers of the garrison, some of whom are now in London, and through whom a whisper of such motives in regard to my seeking employment from Sir H. Ward had already pervaded the clubs here, and been reported to me by my friends, with the addition that Sir H. Ward or his officers declared that my opposition to his measures is only the result of my not obtaining the appointment of his private secretary, an appointment as I have said before not only never asked, but never dreamt of by me, and which so far from soliciting, I certainly would not have accepted if offered.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

London, 15th July, 1850.

*Erectheum Club, St. James's Square,
7th April, 1849.*

SIR,

Allow me as an Ionian the honour of offering you my congratulations on the appointment which Her Majesty has been pleased to confer on you as her representative in the Ionian Islands.

XXX

This appointment, so fortunate for my country, enables me to submit for your perusal the accompanying letter to Earl Grey, which, at the request of my friend, Dr. N. Zambelli, I have translated from the Italian, published and transmitted to his Lordship. I am the more gratified in so doing, inasmuch as in the passage in page 14, where Dr. Zambelli expresses the wish of the Ionians, "that a civilian might be sent to preside over them," he seems especially to point out those characteristics as desirable in a Lord High Commissioner, for which your public career has been so eminently distinguished.

The granting to the Ionian people this wish by their gracious protectress augurs a happy future for them, and I have no doubt that, under your enlightened administration, they may expect an extension of their political freedom.

As one of the few Ionians residing in London, I beg to request to be permitted the honour of waiting upon you, to pay my respects previous to your leaving England.

I have the honour to be, with deep respect,

Your most obedient humble Servant,

(Signed) G. DRACATO PAPANICOLAS.

The Rt. Hon. Henry George Ward,
Admiralty.

Admiralty, April 19th, 1849.

SIR,

I am desired by Mr. Ward to return you his thanks for the pamphlet you sent him, which he has read with interest, and to say that he will endeavour to see you, when he is relieved from the pressure of Admiralty business, and will certainly do so before his departure.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed) SWINBURNE WARD.

'A Monsieur

G. D. Papanicolas,

Erectheum Club, St. James's Square.

*Erectheum Club, St. James's Square,
April 28th, 1849.*

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 19th inst. in answer to my letter addressed to the Rt. Hon. Mr. Ward, and I shall anxiously wait the honour of paying my personal respects to him before his departure for the Ionian Islands. In the mean time,

as I have just received the latest numbers of the *Patris* (the first newspaper published in Corfu since the establishment of a free press in the Islands), I shall be happy to forward them to Mr. Ward should they not have reached him through another channel ; I enclose, however, the last number, which is exceedingly curious, as reflecting the opinion entertained of the protecting country by the intelligent writers of that paper ; and a pamphlet which reached me to-day, which is both interesting and clever.

I am, Sir,

Your very obedient Servant,

(Signed) G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

To Swinburne Ward, Esq.

Admiralty.

Admiralty, May 2nd.

SIR,

I am desired by my father to say that he will be happy to see you to-morrow morning at half-past ten.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) SWINBURNE WARD.

G. D. Papanicolas, Esq.

Erectheum Club.

[Private.]

London, 3rd May, 1849.

SIR,

In great haste, as far as time could allow me, I have gathered what few records I could of the last struggle between my countrymen and Sir Howard Douglas. Since his recall in 1841, nothing has appeared in print until the letter of Dr. Zambelli, which I had the honour to forward to you. The tone assumed in the defence of Sir H. Douglas at that period, and the quasi-reproof administered by the then colonial minister to Mr. Mustoxidi, having disheartened and discouraged all remonstrance in public.

Recent changes have made these reclamations against the policy of Sir H. Douglas valueless, except as matters of history, which now may serve as an amusement for your leisure hours on the voyage.

For myself, I have not until this time considered that my personal services could be of advantage to my country ; but after my interview this day with you, I feel that I should be doing wrong, did I not place myself at your disposal. I perceive that with your inclination to do

justice to my country, and the acknowledged liberality of your sentiments, nothing will be wanting to the prosperity of the Ionians but that you should be fully acquainted with their wants, and be brought into actual contact with the Ionians themselves, free from garrison coteries, and clear of all other prejudices but those in favour of elevating the social and intellectual condition of a people, too long depressed by a system which regarded protection too much in the light of paternity, and looked upon the people as infants and children, to be checked and controlled, rather than as citizens of a free country anxious for its advancement and enlightenment. I have been led into these remarks by an anxiety for my countrymen, and hope for your pardon, encouraged by your kind reception this morning, when indeed I would have gone into more of these and other matters, had my visit been less short, and your departure less immediate.

My wish would be to be attached to your person for the present, in the same private capacity as I was to the King of Belgium, when he was named King of Greece.

My humble claims to this position are a thorough knowledge of four languages, a sufficient experience with the world, and—I hope it is unnecessary to say—an unimpeachable character. I may add to this, a sufficient acquaintance of the rules for conducting a diplomatic correspondence. Prejudices I have none, not even local ones; for I have been twenty-eight years from the Islands, and am known to my fellow citizens but in name and reputation; I shall bring therefore English judgment to Ionian feelings.

Should this offer of mine be in accordance with your ideas, you will be pleased to intimate it to me, and I will follow you immediately to the Islands.

In making this offer, I may as well express *my total disregard of emoluments, my ambition being simply the honour of serving my country under its first Liberal Lord High Commissioner.*

I have now only time, as the hour of your departure is so shortly approaching, to offer my best wishes for your prosperous arrival in my native country, and to have the honour of subscribing myself,

Your most humble and faithful Servant,

(Signed)

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

To the Rt. Hon. Henry George Ward,

&c. &c. Admiralty.

This correspondence and letters appeared in the *Patris* of August 17, 1850; and, to my astonishment, was followed by another article in the *Φίλος του Λαού* of 10th Sept., which repeated the ridiculous assertion of the

writer, who impudently insisted on taking the above correspondence as an admission of his charges. This Article, written in Italian, was translated into English in the *Malta Mail* of 20th September, 1850, to the Editor of which paper I, at the time, addressed the following letter, enclosing also a copy of my correspondence with Sir H. Ward, and my answer to the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ:—

To the Editor of "THE MALTA MAIL."

SIR,

In your paper of the 20th September, there is an article headed "Correspondence of Sig. Georgio Papanicolas," to which you state "you have been requested to give a place in the columns of your journal."

The "*animus*" of such a request to insert comments on a correspondence, *without the correspondence itself*, must be apparent to all. Permit me therefore, on my own part, and for the sake of fair play, to request, from your sense of justice, your insertion of the letters on which that article is a comment. I can then safely leave the judgment upon them to yourself and your readers. It may be as well for me here to say that I was piqued into an offer to serve my country on this occasion, by an expression which dropped from Sir H. Ward in the course of our conversation, which almost humbled me. "You have then, Mr. P., been thirty years in England, and your country has, as yet, reaped no advantages from your education and talents." *Upon this hint I spoke.* But, sir, it will not escape your discrimination that, had I desired employment "under Sir H. Ward," as the writer of the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ would have it supposed, I should have applied some time before, when I had the opportunity open to me, and not as an after-thought, just five hours before Sir Henry Ward's departure for the Island.

I should not have troubled you on the subject, were it not that assertions of this nature assume the importance of substantial charges, when they find admission into the columns of a respectable journal such as the *Malta Mail*.

I enclose you my answer to the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ, and trust you will show me equal courtesy, by giving it a corner in your paper.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

London, 16th Oct., 1850.

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

To the Editor of 'Ο Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ.

SIR,

Although greatly disinclined to be led astray from that earnest attention to the public interests of my country, which I have prescribed to myself as a duty, by any merely personal attacks, I will yet suffer myself to be diverted from my usual course in replying to your article of the 10th August,—first, because the Ionian press is young, and requires therefore that more courtesy be shown to its representatives; and, secondly, because in that article, whether as a rhetorical artifice to help out a failure of truth, or whether from an over-susceptibility of feeling, you seem to consider yourself as the person attacked. So have I seen a jealous woman, convinced of the absurdity of her charge against her lover's constancy, turn round upon him with tears, and poutingly accuse him of making her angry.

The writer of a letter, Sir, may always be considered the best judge and interpreter of what he intended to say; and when I forwarded my correspondence with Sir H. Ward to the *Patrie*, it was to prove that you were mistaken in the assertion you made, "that I opposed the policy of Sir H. Ward, because he refused to make me his private Secretary." I thought that such a publication would have been an answer sufficiently satisfactory even to yourself, the more especially as those letters showed that the offer of my services to my country was entirely gratuitous, and with no other object than that of more effectually serving that country on the spot, under a Liberal Lord High Commissioner, as I flatter myself I have done for years at a distance.

But there are some minds which, though convinced, will still continue to assert an error, and would rather have the reputation of obstinacy than the credit of truth. To such I should be wanting in self-respect to reply, were I to reply, since if evidence will not convince, argument will be thrown away upon them. I may not, however, pass without notice a passage in your article in which, by a covert allusion, you would lead your readers to suppose that I had made a claim upon the Liberals of my country for my exertions, such as they are, against the tyrannies of Sir Howard Douglas. This I pronounce at once to be a false calumny; I defy you, Sir, and any man to say, I asked recompense for the exertions I then made, or the heavy expenses I then voluntarily took upon myself. To say that I received none, is unnecessary. I should be wrong to be angry at so very silly an insinuation; its falseness comes within the knowledge of all; it is too ridiculous even to trouble my friends to refute. You go on to say, Sir, that I am the servant of a "Party!" Indeed! Where is it? Of what party in the Islands do my letters represent the opinion?

Of the Radicals? Certainly not. I advocate the "Protection," as most conducive to the interest of the Islands; and so far from representing as you assert, the Ionians as desirous to withdraw from it, I have always pointed out, with great regret, the tendency of the conduct of the present Government to produce so deplorable a climax, and prayed them to avert it by a change of policy. But I attack Sir H. Ward as the organ of personal views, and am blinded by personal vengeance. Why, then, did I attack Sir H. Douglas? Did I ask *him* to make me his private Secretary? What personal views can actuate me? I have been thirty years out of the Islands. With the exception of Mr. Zambelli, three years since, and Mr. Mustoxidi, now ten years ago, I have no correspondence with the Islands. Whom, then, do I represent? What feelings do I evidence but those of an honest and conscientious patriot, who, far from prejudices and factions, keeps his eye steadily fixed, solely, on the good of his country.

I have yet to learn that an Ionian gentleman of mature age and of competent acquirements, is to be precluded from the noblest ambition in life, that of working out the good of his fellow-countrymen. It is, Sir, to the interest of every country, that competent persons should feel it also their interest to serve her. In this instance, Sir, however, could I give no other reason, as a contradiction to your inference, I know my country to be poor, and would not take money from her. I the more especially felt it my duty to make this offer, from the necessity which I had long perceived to exist for some person to be interested in the government of the Ionian Islands, who (to say nothing of an acquaintance with both languages) combined Ionian feeling with a knowledge of English character and habits of thought.

It must be unnecessary for me to point out to you, that it is the duty of a public writer not to promulgate falsehoods, but to look for documents and proofs, before pronouncing *ex cathedra* against any man's character. There are those, Sir, who credulously imagine an Editor to be always furnished with proof, if necessary, to substantiate any assertion that appears in his paper. This class of readers, Sir, is much larger than you suppose; it combines the extremely ignorant and the extremely idle; the one too ignorant to inquire, the other too ignorant to think for themselves.

It is to such persons that I should wish my contradiction to go through your columns; no other class of individuals in the Ionian Islands would entertain the opinion you express in regard to my conduct and views; and I therefore request from you the favour of an insertion of this letter in your next impression: reserving to myself, should that insertion be delayed beyond a few days, the right of giving it publicity through some other less partial channel.

This is the first and the last time I shall appear in any such unseemly controversy. The combat is as *unequal* as it is unworthy ; neither is my pen cut to quarrel with *my countrymen*. I therefore request, Sir, that should in the heat of writing, any expression have escaped me which may seem injurious to your self-esteem, you will set it down to the mistake we have mutually fallen into ; you, that I could have been actuated in advocating our country's cause, by base motive, and I, that any political heat or hostility could so far carry away any Ionian, as to induce him to evince malignity or vindictive feeling towards,

Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

London, 16th October, 1850.

G. D. PAPANICOLAS.

The Editor of the *Malta Mail* not choosing to insert this last letter, and the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ having refused to do so, under the frivolous excuse " that it was written in English," I forwarded it to the *Patris*, where it has appeared. It is unnecessary to trouble the reader further with the reply of the Φίλος τοῦ Λαοῦ, as it was simply impertinent ! Subsequent inquiries having led me to a knowledge of this would-be public writer, I found him to be an unworthy person, and of foreign extraction, who had edited, shortly before, a liberal and opposition paper, entitled the *Timone*. With such a weathercock I thought a controversy, on my part, would have been unbecoming and indecorous. Here, therefore, I dropt the subject.

(L.)

Mr. Bowen, not satisfied with the high rank and appreciation which he has assured to himself in society at Corfu by claiming a relationship with Lord Aberdeen (that of being his lordship's godson), whence his *sobriquet* of " Young Aberdeen," has not hesitated to claim to himself publicly in Corfu the credit of having written a certain letter, dated Vienna, 9th November, which appeared in the *Times* of the 22nd November, 1848. This wonderful letter gives a Munchausen-like account of the writer's mighty anger, that the Provisional Government of Vienna did not set aside all other cares, to provide for the Rector's

accommodation, even while the Imperial and Croatian armies were thundering at their gates; and of the valorous feats against the liberties of the Austrian people, to which his consequent indignation prompted him. There are others, also, so unsparing of their respect for Mr. Bowen's reputation, as to accuse him of being the furnisher of a certain article in the *Times*, 1849, bitterly libellous of the Ionians. But of what I have no proof I will not speak. I will simply recommend to Mr. Bowen, that when he reads his first letter in question, and recounts his warlike deeds with so much self-congratulation, that it would be advisable he should also add, as an appendix, the following extract from a notice of it, which appeared in the *Sun* London newspaper at the time, where the epithets of spy and informer are lavished on the Oxford Earl:—

SIEGE OF VIENNA IN 1848.

*Letter from a Member of the University of Oxford to the TIMES, dated
Vienna, 9th of November, 1848.*

. The old generals who recollect Austerlitz, Moscow, and Leipsick, are comparing with the most brilliant exploits of Hannibal and Napoleon Jellachitsch's march across Hungary, a hostile and most difficult country, at a time when the emperor had repeatedly ordered him to submit to the rebels, and had left his army wholly unprovided for. On that dreadful night of the 31st October, I saw Jellachitsch, by the blaze of the burning houses, and the flashing of 200 cannon, lead his wild Croats and Servians to the storm, his white plume shining like Henry IV.'s at Ivry, as the pole-star of the whole army. All agree that he is one of those remarkable men who are raised up from time to time to mould the destinies of nations.

After acknowledging that he had enjoyed the hospitality of the Viennese, and had been welcomed with particular affection by the students of the Austrian Universities, this English traveller coolly remarks: "On Sunday morning, the 29th of October, my friend H. and I managed to escape from one of the advanced barricades, whither we had been pressed, into the Leopoldstadt, where we were most kindly received by the troops, both officers and men, *to whom we were able to give valuable information as to the real state and disposition of the rebel forces.*" So that this English gentleman, this honourable member of the University of Oxford, was literally a spy

among the unfortunate Viennese, and the unblushing informer of Jellachitsch and Windishgrätz. We envy our contemporary (the *Times*) its pride in the dignity and credibility of its vaunted correspondent. To our obtuse comprehension, the character of the member of the University of Oxford, who first betrays the Viennese, and afterwards traduces them, is not one jot less despicable than that of Dobbin, the Irish spy, or that of Powell, the Chartist informer. Hear him rejoicing over the downfall of the capital of Austria, although "the beautiful suburbs were being riddled with shells and shot;" although "his senses were stunned by the roar of cannon, the whizzing of rockets, and the roll of musketry;" although "weeping wives, sisters, and daughters, were picking literally piecemeal out of the ruins the consumed bodies of their relations." "At length the firing behind us gradually slackened, and then died away, and towards sun-set the victorious Imperialists marched back from the field of battle, having utterly routed the Hungarians, and driven 3,000 of them into the Danube, which will roll their dead bodies down to Pesth, a fearful tidings of their defeat." In alluding to the rigour of the victors, the Oxford University spy and informer is in a trance of exultation. "Martial law," says he, with a cynical sneer of indifference, "is of course proclaimed, and the leaders of the revolt are being shot in batches as they are caught;" mentioning the inhuman *battue* as calmly as though the victims were as many wild boars and shakals. Listen particularly to the following record of these atrocities, and say if the passage is not despicable for its depraved and inhuman callousness: "We have seen the execution of several of the chief students, who had rather fraternized with us as English University-men on our first arrival, but who latterly had become too great men to condescend to notice or protect us from outrage; so we feel no pity for them. The great body of the students who have borne arms are to be forced to serve as common soldiers among the savage Croats." These sentences need no comment. We lament that our contemporaries have condescended to calumniate the population of a conquered capital, and that they have had the temerity to enforce their misrepresentations with the narrative of a man who announces himself *to be a spy and an informer*, at the very moment he is paraded before us as "a student of Oxford and a gentleman of England."—[*The Sun*, 23rd of November, 1848.]



